

June 9, 1966

ments made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading, or

(c) to engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon the investor.

INVESTIGATIONS, INJUNCTIONS AND PROSECUTION OF OFFENSES

SEC. 18. (a) Whenever it shall appear to the Commission that any person is engaged or about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of this Act, or of any rule or regulation prescribed thereunder, it may, in its discretion, bring an action in any district court of the United States, or the United States District court for the District of Columbia to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond. The Commission may transmit such evidence as may be available concerning such acts or practices to the Attorney General who may, in his discretion, institute the appropriate criminal proceedings under this Act.

(b) The Commission may, in its discretion, make such investigations as it deems necessary to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this title or any rule or regulation thereunder, and may require or permit any person to file with it a statement in writing, under oath or otherwise as the Commission shall determine, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated. The Commission is authorized, in its discretion, to publish information concerning any such violations, and to investigate any facts, conditions, practices, or matters which it may deem necessary or proper to aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this title, in the prescribing of rules and regulations thereunder, or in securing information to serve as a basis for recommending further legislation concerning the matters to which this title relates.

(c) For the purpose of any such investigation, or any other proceeding under this title, any member of the Commission or any officer designated by it is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, correspondence, memorandums, or other records which the Commission deems relevant or material to the inquiry. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of any such records may be required from any place in the United States or any State at any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to, any person, the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memorandums, and other records. And such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or member or officer designated by the Commission, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found. Any person who shall, without just cause, fail or refuse to attend and testify or to answer any lawful inquiry or to produce books, papers, correspondence, memorandums, and other records, if in his power so to do, in obedience

to the subpoena of the Commission, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or both.

(e) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, contracts, agreements, and other records and documents before the Commission, or in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission or any member thereof or any officer designated by it, or in any cause or proceeding instituted by the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subject to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

HEARINGS BY COMMISSION

SEC. 19. All hearings shall be public and may be held before the Commission or an officer or officers of the Commission designated by it, and appropriate records thereof shall be kept.

UNLAWFUL REPRESENTATIONS

SEC. 20. Neither the fact that the registration statement for interests, lots, or parcels in a subdivision has been filed or is in effect nor the fact that a stop order is not in effect with respect thereto shall be deemed a finding by the Commission that the registration statement is true and accurate on its face or that it does not contain an untrue statement of fact or omit to state a material fact, or be held to mean that the Commission has in any way passed upon the merits of, or given approval to, such interests, lots, or parcels. It shall be unlawful to make, or cause to be made, to any prospective purchaser any representation contrary to the foregoing provisions of this section.

PENALTIES

SEC. 21. Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this title, or the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, or any person who willfully, in a registration statement filed under this title, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

RULES, REGULATIONS, AND ORDERS

SEC. 22. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, issue, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations and such orders as are necessary or appropriate to the exercise of the functions and powers conferred upon the Commission elsewhere in this Act. For the purpose of its rules and regulations the Commission may classify persons and matters within its jurisdiction and prescribe different requirements for different classes of persons or matters.

JURISDICTION OF OFFENSES AND SUITS

SEC. 23. (a) The district courts of the United States, the United States courts of any territory, and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of offenses and violations under this title and under the rules and regulations promulgated by the Commission in respect thereto, and concurrent with State and territorial courts, of all suits in equity and actions at law brought to enforce any liability or duty created by this title. Any such suit or action may be brought in the district

wherein the defendant is found or is an inhabitant or transacts business, or in the district where the offer or sale took place, if the defendant participated therein, and process in such cases may be served in any other district of which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found. Judgments and decrees so rendered shall be subject to review as provided in sections 128 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U.S.C. 225, 347). No case arising under this title and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States. No costs shall be assessed for or against the Commission in any proceeding under this title brought by or against it in the Supreme Court or such other courts.

NOTICE CONCERNING THE NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Marion Mathias Hale, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Texas, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Robert I. Nash, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Texas, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Tully Reynolds, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Texas, term of 4 years—reappointment.

Louis C. LaCour, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Louisiana, term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in the above nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, June 16, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 9, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2421. An act to authorize the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Columbia River at the mouth project in the States of Washington and Oregon; and

S. 2469. An act amending sections 2 and 4 of the act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), providing for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a new sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

U THAN'S COUNSEL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the American people have every reason to be distressed over the intensity of the civil war in which this administration has involved us in Vietnam. Recent events point up the terrible extension of this fighting and slaughter which has been going on for years in Vietnam. The immolation of Buddhists in the insurrection and revolt against Prime Minister Ky is becoming increasingly terrifying.

June 9, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080014-5 - 12115
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

misleading, or (ii) such part of the registration statement did not fairly represent his statement as an expert or was not a fair copy of or extract from his report or valuation as an expert; and (C) as regards any part of the registration statement purporting to be made on the authority of an expert (other than himself) or purporting to be a copy of or extract from a report or valuation of an expert (other than himself), he had no reasonable ground to believe and did not believe, at the time such part of the registration statement became effective, that the statements herein were untrue or that there was an omission to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, or that such part of the registration statement did not fairly represent the statement of the expert or was not a fair copy of or extract from the report or valuation of the expert; and (D) as regards any part of the registration statement purporting to be a statement made by an official person or purporting to be a copy of or extract from a public official document, he had no reasonable ground to believe and did not believe, at the time such part of the registration statement became effective, that the statements therein were untrue, or that there was an omission to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, or that such part of the registration statement did not fairly represent the statement made by the official person or was not a fair copy of or extract from the public official document.

(c) In determining, for the purpose of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of this section, what constitutes reasonable investigation and reasonable ground for belief, the standard of reasonableness shall be that required of a prudent man in the management of his own property.

(d) The suit authorized under subsection (a) may be to recover such damages as shall represent the difference between the amount paid for the interest, lot, or parcel (not exceeding the price at which it was offered to the public) and (1) the value thereof as of the time such suit was brought, or (2) the price at which such interest, lot, or parcel shall have been disposed of in the market before suit, or (3) the price at which such interest, lot, or parcel shall have been disposed of after suit but before judgment if such damages shall be less than the damages representing the difference between the amount paid for the interest, lot, or parcel in a subdivision (not exceeding the price at which it was offered to the public) and the value thereof as of the time such suit was brought: *Provided*, That if the defendant proves that any portion or all of such damages represents other than the depreciation in value of such interest, lot, or parcel resulting from such part of the registration statement, with respect to which his liability is asserted, not being true or omitting to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, such portion or all such damages shall not be recoverable. In any suit under this or any other section of this title the court may, in its discretion, require an undertaking for the payment of the costs of such suit, including reasonable attorney's fees, and if judgment shall be rendered against a party litigant, upon the motion of the other party litigant, such costs may be assessed in favor of such party litigant (whether or not such undertaking has been required) if the court believes the suit or the defense to have been without merit, in an amount sufficient to reimburse him for the reasonable expenses incurred by him, in connection with such suit, such costs to be taxed in the manner usually provided for taxing of costs in the court in which the suit was heard.

(e) All or any one or more of the persons specified in subsection (a) shall be jointly and severally liable, and every person who becomes liable to make any payment under this section may recover contribution as in cases of contract from any person who, if sued separately, would have been liable to make the same payment, unless the person who has become liable was, and the other was not, guilty of fraudulent misrepresentation.

(f) In no case shall the amount recoverable under this section exceed the price at which the interest, lot, or parcel was offered to the public.

CIVIL LIABILITIES ARISING IN CONNECTION WITH PROSPECTUSES AND COMMUNICATIONS

SEC. 11. Any developer or agent who—

(1) offers, sells, or leases an interest, lot, or parcel in a subdivision in violation of section 4 of this Act, or

(2) offers, sells, or leases an interest, lot, or parcel in a subdivision by the use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails, by means of a prospectus or other communication, written or oral, which includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading (the purchaser not knowing of such untruth or omission), and who shall not sustain the burden of proof that he did not know, and in the exercise of reasonable care could not have known, of such untruth or omission, shall be liable to the person purchasing such interest from him, who may sue either at law or in equity in any court of competent jurisdiction, to recover the consideration paid for such interest with interest thereon, less the amount of any income received thereon, upon the tender of such interest, or for damages if he no longer owns such interest.

INELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN PERSONS

SEC. 12. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to act as developer or agent who within ten years has been convicted of any felony, misdemeanor, or is subject to a stop order, or permanent injunction involving the purchase or sale of any interest in land, or of any security, or arising out of such person's conduct as a developer, or agent, or as an underwriter, broker, dealer, or investment adviser as defined in title 15, United States Code, or involving embezzlement, fraudulent conversion, or misappropriation of funds, securities, or interests in land, or involving the violation of sections 1341, 1342, or 1343 of title 18, United States Code, or who has been found by the Commission to have willfully violated any provision of any Act which it administers or who has been found to have been a cause of such violation.

(b) Any person who is ineligible, by reason of subsection (a), to act as developer or agent, may file with the Commission an application for an exemption from the provisions of that subsection. The Commission shall by order grant such application, either unconditionally or on an appropriate temporary or other conditional basis, if it is established that the prohibitions of subsection (a), as applied to such person, are unduly or disproportionately severe or that the conduct of such persons has been such as not to make it against the public interest or protection of investors to grant such application.

COURT REVIEW OF ORDERS

SEC. 13. (a) Any person aggrieved by an order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in the Court of Appeals of the United States, within any circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court, within sixty days after the entry of such order, a

written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or be set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall file in the court the record upon which the order complained of was entered, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. No objection to the order of the Commission shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Commission. The finding of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of the original order. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree, affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole, or in part, any order of the Commission, shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U.S.C. 346-347).

(b) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

SEC. 14. No action shall be maintained to enforce any liability created under section 10 or 11(2) unless brought within three years after the discovery of the untrue statement or the omission, or after such discovery should have been made by the exercise of reasonable diligence, or, if the action is to enforce a liability created under section 11(1), unless brought within three years after the violation upon which it is based. In no event shall any such action be brought to enforce a liability created under section 10 more than five years after the sale of all the interests, lots, or parcels which are the subject of a particular offering (other than any as to which the offering has been withdrawn), or under section 11(2) more than five years after the sale.

CONTRARY STIPULATIONS VOID

SEC. 15. Any condition, stipulation, or provision binding any person acquiring any interest, lot, or parcel in a subdivision to waive compliance with any provision of this title or of the rules and regulations of the Commission shall be void.

ADDITIONAL REMEDIES

SEC. 16. The rights and remedies provided by this Act shall be in addition to any and all other rights and remedies that may exist at law or in equity.

FRAUDULENT INTERSTATE TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 17. It shall be unlawful for any developer or agent in the offer or sale or lease of any interests, lots, or parcels in any subdivision by the use of any means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or by the use of the mails, directly or indirectly—

(a) to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud, or

(b) to make any untrue statement of a material fact or to omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the state-

SENATE June 9, 1966

The magazine Oregon Education, in its May issue, reports the effects of smoking on young people and bases its shocking statement of the effect of smoking on teenagers on a recent report of the American Cancer Society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Immediate Effects of Smoking on Young People" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECTS OF SMOKING ON YOUNG PEOPLE

(By Charles Starr and Wade B. Patterson)

The American Public Health Association has stated that one million school-age children today are expected to die of lung cancer before they reach the age of 70. Others have also predicted that 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 more will die from other diseases relating to smoking such as cancer of the bladder, emphysema, and cardiovascular diseases.

These predictions startle us and we realize that we must redouble our efforts to educate young people on the effects of smoking and change their attitudes so that they may be better prepared in dealing with the smoking question. In accomplishing this objective, we may well stress the immediate effects as well as the long range effects of tobacco usage. The immediate effects of smoking on young people can be broken down into the external physical effects, the internal physical effects, the economic effects, and the social effects.

EXTERNAL EFFECTS

Any person who smokes cigarettes regularly is going to have characteristic external effects that become part of his personality. Among these are bad breath, which is seldom improved by eating life-savers; a smell of smoke on the clothes, the hair and the body, and a yellowish-brown stain on the fingers and often on the teeth.

INTERNAL EFFECTS

The internal physical effects are less known, but more dramatic in their serious consequences.

We know, for example, that cigarette smoke contains compounds such as ammonia which irritate the throat and nasal passages. Tobacco irritants cause a progressive paralysis of the cilia and an increased secretion of mucus in the presence of foreign particles. The paralysis of the cilia and the increased mucus cause the need for coughing to relieve irritation in the bronchial passages. This coughing may become persistent and open the way for bronchitis and other respiratory problems.

Cigarette smoking is known to cause constriction of arteries, increased pulse rate (10-15 beats per minute) and increase in blood pressure. The exchange of gases in the air sacs in the lungs is less efficient. As a result, there is an extra demand on the heart to increase the flow of blood to supply enough oxygen to the cells. This factor, along with carbon-monoxide displacement of oxygen in red blood cells, hinders the performance of athletes in strenuous sports. Dr. Milton Brinton reports that the smoker's lung capacity is 30 per cent less than the non-smoker. Cigarette smoke slows down digestion and may cause dizziness, decreases appetite and may affect the diet, increases the chances for ulcers. It also weakens the taste buds on the tongue, thus food is less tasty.

Statistics show that smoking increases the chances of a young woman giving birth to a premature and undernourished baby. Premature birth rate for non-smokers, in a study

conducted on nearly 3,000 Baltimore women was 11.2 per cent as opposed to 22.9 per cent for heavy smokers. The death rate of children from smoking mothers was 15 out of every 1,000 births whereas, the non-smoking mothers only lost 6 children per 1,000 births, or less than one half the babies lost by the mothers that smoked.

Thirty-six per cent of the women who smoke have menstrual disorders compared with 18 per cent in non-smokers.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Cigarette smoking has economic effects on the individual, both long range and immediate. A person who smokes only one pack of cigarettes a day for one year will have spent around \$100, depending on the state in which he lives. This can add up fast, especially if he increases his habit to two or three packs a day.

The cost of cigarette smoking, according to the Spokane Public Schools, is as follows:

Packs smoked per day	Savings if money put in bank		
	5 years	10 years	15 years
1-----	\$610	\$1,327	\$2,160
1½-----	915	1,990	3,240
2-----	1,830	3,981	6,480

The average teen-ager could save over \$10,000 (interest included) in a life-time, plus living a healthier life if he would choose not to smoke.

Another important economic effect is the cost of smoker's carelessness in fire loss every year. In Oregon alone, smokers cause about \$2,000,000 in fire loss every year. This, of course, does not include the harm to the person and loss of life oftentimes involved.

One national life insurance company has a 5 per cent discount in cost for non-smokers. Actually the insurance companies could offer a bigger discount since it is reported that 50 per cent more heavier smokers are hospitalized than non-smokers.

SOCIAL EFFECTS

What does a teen-ager look like when he or she has a cigarette hanging out of the side of the mouth? What about the teen who puts on an air of sophistication or glamour? Does he become more—or less—attractive and acceptable, to his fellow students?

In the Hazelwood Senior High School, Missouri, the school has created the climate that "It's Smart Not To Smoke." This attitude was established through the efforts of the school staff and students after an intensive campaign designed to inform the students about smoking hazards. Many students stopped smoking through social pressures. Others have been convinced that it's smart not to start. Campaigns such as this can eventually establish a cultural pattern that smoking will make one less popular with his fellow classmates.

The social effects of smoking on young people can also be pointed out by citing some findings of a study of Portland high school pupil smoking habits conducted in 1959 by the American Cancer Society. Researchers discovered in this study that smokers were less successful in social activities; they didn't take part in clubs or social groups. They found that the smokers were also less successful in athletic activities and showed a significant lack of scholastic achievement and initiative.

George E. Coraker, a teacher from East-Ridge High School, Rochester, compared non-smokers and smokers of similar age, grade, and I.Q. Coraker states that, "Smoking tends to create disorders of personality which causes disorders of memory." Of those students starting to smoke in high school,

68 per cent showed decreases in grades of 10 per cent to failure. The non-smokers had better grades and took tougher subjects than the smokers.

Teens who are particular, may prefer dates who do not smoke. As one teen-ager in Spokane, Washington, stated, "Nothing cools love's flame faster than the sickening odor of cigarette breath."

From a social point of view, most teenagers have an effect on their fellow students. Their habits and attitudes concerning smoking may influence others not to start, to start, or to stop. The American Cancer Society's Annual Report (1964) states that the Gilbert Youth Research, Inc., survey in 1958 showed that 33 per cent of the American high school students said they smoked cigarettes. A second survey carried out in 1963, showed that the percentage of teen-agers who said they smoked had dropped to 29 per cent. A 1964 survey indicated a still further drop in high school smoking. Only 17 per cent of the teen-agers said they then smoked.

Apparently those who once started to smoke continue; but beginning to smoke is far less fashionable. An immediate school social effect could be that as time passes on, people who are tempted to start smoking will get the reputation that they live dangerously, that they are not using their intelligence to the best of their ability. In other words, it's smart not to start, or it's smart not to smoke.

When we add to this list of effects of smoking, the results of a study in England that showed that 80 per cent of the smokers who tried their first cigarette in their teens were habituated within two years, we soon realize that smoking definitely has some very profound and immediate effects, even on the young. We must therefore, elaborate and emphasize these immediate effects as well as the long range effects as we attempt to improve the situation and reduce the prediction of the American Public Health Association of 1,000,000 teen-agers dying from just lung cancer before age 70 to none.

OUR ALLIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the questions we hear repeatedly in connection with this Nation's commitment in southeast Asia is, "Where are our friends, our allies?"

Richard Wilson, writing in yesterday's Evening Star, has given a large part of the answer. Britain, he points out, has succeeded to large degree in protecting the State of Malaysia by the commitment of about 50,000 troops and \$600 million in its defense funds. I would add that other allies, too, are contributing in various ways. Thailand, of course, is holding its own on its own territory. Korea, Australia, New Zealand and others are contributing to the efforts in Vietnam. And the British, as Mr. Wilson has reminded readers, are doing a vital job of stabilizing the course of events in yet another vital area of southeast Asia. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his column in the Evening Star on British firmness in southeast Asia be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH FIRMNESS PAYS OFF IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Richard Wilson)

All the while, and longer, that the United States has been deeply involved in Viet Nam, the British have been committed to holding the line in another part of Southeast

June 9, 1966

ing power cannot be usefully applied to Indian education.

How the proposed Foundation's initial fund of almost Rs 150 crores is to be invested is a question which has yet to be settled. It is a reasonable assumption that the funds will be invested in Government securities of one kind or another and it can also be assumed that the Foundation will have a recurring annual income of some six crores of rupees if not more. Even if the Foundation's overhead expenses are extremely high it will still have at least five crores of rupees at its disposal every year for aiding educational institutions and promoting re-education.

This would be a much higher sum than what is available to the University Grants Commission for similar purposes. In 1964-65 the UGC was able to give grants of Rs two crores for the development of scientific education and research, Rs one crore for the development of education and research in the humanities and social sciences, and a similar sum for the development of engineering and technological education. However, this money had to be spread over a very large number of institutions and a good part of it was spent on the construction of laboratory buildings and other structures. It is possible to suspect that the funds available for actual research projects were very meager indeed.

The Indo-American Foundation on the other hand will be in a much happier position. It will be able to give funds on an effective scale for research and other projects of its choice. While the effective promotion of research is all to the good, Mrs. Gandhi's Government should consider some of the other consequences. Almost every department in every university and other institutions of higher education will start looking to the new Foundation rather than the UGC for aid and guidance. Scholars who are enthusiastic about a project and are starved for funds are not greatly concerned where the money comes from. They are understandably anxious to get things done and when they weigh their chances of getting the necessary funds they will almost inevitably turn toward the Foundation. The Foundation in turn will decide what project or which institution deserves its assistance. It is not difficult to foresee that within a few years the Foundation would come to occupy the commanding heights of the educational and research scene.

OTHER PROGRAMMES

At the moment the foreign aid programmes at the university level are operated by the University Grants Commission in collaboration with the relevant Union Ministry. This is true not only of the programmes assisted by UNESCO, the Soviet Union and Britain; it is also true of the programmes financed from PL-480 counterpart funds which have already been set aside for research projects in agricultural, physical and biological sciences. But judging from what President Johnson has said, the proposed Foundation would be treated on a very different footing.

It is not enough to have distinguished citizens of both countries on the Foundation's board of directors. It is additionally desirable to ensure that the board is mainly composed of Indian representatives who while having a modern outlook see the country's educational and research needs through Indian eyes. This apart, two other things are equally necessary. Firstly, the UGC must be actively associated with the Indo-American Foundation in such a way as to ensure the Commission's overall control in the field of higher education. Secondly, the funds at the disposal of the UGC itself should be increased sufficiently to enable it to promote research and development as effectively as the Foundation. That the Indo-American Foundation can do a great deal of good is obvious enough. Some of its disturbing possibilities might be

less obvious, but they should not be overlooked on that account. They should be recognized and removed as far as possible when the details of the agreement are negotiated. It might be thought that all this is unnecessarily alarmist. But in a vital field such as education no country can afford to let the initiative pass into alien hands.

FEARS ABOUT INDO-U.S. FOUNDATION UNFOUNDED

NEW DELHI, April 12.—Dr. John Hope Franklin, the visiting U.S. historian feels the Delhi University teachers' criticism of the proposed Indo-U.S. education foundation was premature and a little presumptuous.

"The underlying assumption seems to be that the proposed foundation was meant to benefit India alone," he said in an interview today. "I should like to think it might benefit Americans as much."

The fears expressed in the teachers' criticism were based on conjecture. "We don't know anything about the shape it will take. Suppose," Dr. Franklin said, "500 American teachers were to be financed by the scheme to come and learn Indian history here; who would benefit? Naturally the Americans. It has got to be a two-way affair."

Visiting India for the fourth time, Dr. Franklin is reviewing the working of the Fulbright programme. This is in his capacity as vice-chairman of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Washington, to which he was appointed by President Kennedy. "But I am not a Government servant," he added with a meaningful smile.

He attaches great importance to exchange programmes at the intellectual level. It was a pity, he said that the average American was not as knowledgeable about India as an average literate Indian was about the United States.

And he explained it as though he were in his classroom in the University of Chicago. For various reasons, historical and otherwise, the Americans were so engrossed in their own affairs that they did not pay any attention to Europe, "leave alone Asia."

"It was only after the Second War that America became a global country; the result was that we have a lot to make up," he said.

Dr. Franklin's answers to questions on Vietnam and racialism in his country were true to his name. "I hate war, have hated it from my childhood, and I know it is not the way to solve anything, but then I am not clear on the alternatives. I wish I knew the way out," he said.

CIVIL RIGHTS

How far had the anti-segregation laws been implemented in the United States, and to what effect? A sudden change took place in the smiling face. The question seemed to have touched the Negro in Dr. Franklin. But this lasted a moment. The affable professor took over again.

"This has two planks to it: the Civil Rights Law of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965," the professor said and explained the substantial impact the legislation has had on the segregationists. But the problem had deep roots. Discrimination in employment and housing in a handful of major cities which contained one-third of the Negro population was still an acute and serious problem. It was strange, Dr. Franklin agreed, that a country so advanced and affluent should be so backward emotionally. It was equally strange, he further agreed, that Negroes with all their contribution to American arts, music and sports should still be fighting for civil rights.

Dr. Franklin felt the problem of civil rights would find full and complete solution within this generation. As for a change in the feelings and attitudes of the White Supremacists, "it is difficult to predict anything in the field of human failings," he said, paused and then added: "You can't tell when people

would stop hating each other." And there was again a far-away look in his eyes.

[From the Times of India, Apr. 8, 1966]
**MRS. GANDHI ALLAYS MPs' MISGIVINGS—
INDO-AMERICAN EDUCATION FOUNDATION**

NEW DELHI, April 7.—The Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, assured the Executive Committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party today that the proposed Indo-American Education Foundation was in the best interests of the country and there was no basis for any misgivings on this score.

She and the Education Minister, Mr. M. C. Chagla, explained the objects of the foundation after critical references to it by two senior members who asked for further details.

The Prime Minister is understood to have taken strong exception to doubts expressed by one member about American intentions. She remarked that such an attitude created misunderstanding and difficulties. If doubts were expressed about the intentions of countries giving aid, they could also entertain similar doubts about the recipient country.

GOVERNMENT'S APPROVAL

The proposal to have such a foundation had been under consideration for some time and was approved by the Government last year. It would be administered in a manner consistent with India's interests and all its schemes and programmes would be subject to the approval of the Indian Government. No money would be spent without prior sanction.

Mr. Chagla sought to remove the wrong notion that the foundation might influence the Indian way of life and culture. He said that no effort would be made to influence the educational system.

Critics of the foundation were reported to have argued that involvement of a foreign government in matters affecting the country's educational system might lead to serious consequences. Since the foundation was to be run by a joint board, there was nothing to prevent interference by the donor country. It might like to utilize the funds for spreading the American way of life and culture. In the absence of more details, it would be difficult to accept the proposal, they said.

IMPROPER AND UNFAIR

One member felt that it was highly improper and unfair to doubt American intentions. India was extremely backward in the field of education and was in urgent need of technical knowhow. The U.S. Government had shown a great gesture by deciding to invest Rs. 142 crores in the foundation. He had no doubt that if the same proposal had come from the Soviet Union, it would have been readily accepted by the critics.

Misgivings were also expressed about the proposal to route the Western foreign aid through the World Bank. Some members asked whether this would not give the aid a private sector orientation since the World Bank was a private investment agency.

A reference was also made during discussions to the protocol in Britain where the visiting Prime Minister of a Commonwealth country was received at London airport not by his counterpart in Britain but by the Commonwealth Relations Secretary. It was suggested that the Indian Prime Minister should not go to the airport to receive the British Prime Minister when he visited India. The protocol in this matter should be on a reciprocal basis.

TEENAGE SMOKING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, who would not be shocked to pick up the morning paper and see a stark black headline—"One Million Teenagers Dying From Lung Cancer?"

Asia. About 50,000 British troops and \$600 million in British defense funds have been involved.

The average American has probably never heard of this commitment. If he had heard of it he may have considered it a ragged remnant of Britain's once proud colonialism, the last gasp of empire, as did the political left wing in England.

The news about Britain's last stand is that it has succeeded. This success causes quiet satisfaction in the Johnson administration in Washington, and it is not hard to see why.

The dogged British have demonstrated that a Western power's determined resistance to Communist-aligned expansion in Southeast Asia can pay off. The calculated use of strength, and, above all, persistence and stubbornness, can have a decisive effect on events and on leaders and governments whose policies may be forced to change.

When the infant state of Malaysia was created three years ago Indonesia's China-oriented dictator, Sukarno, took measure of its weakness and decided to lop off part of it in Northern Borneo. The larger part of Borneo is Indonesian. A "confrontation" followed that drew down Britain's commitment to protect the independence of the infant state and hold the line against Communist expansionism in Southeast Asia.

Last week the new leaders of Indonesia, who had brought down Sukarno in an anti-Communist blood bath estimated to have taken the lives of 300,000 people, brought the "confrontation" to an end in a quick agreement with Malaysia that left Malaysia with its portion of North Borneo. The "confrontation" was simply costing too much, and the Indonesian generals had no heart for it in view of Britain's stubbornness.

With this agreement some current myths suffered a bad beating. One of these myths is that the West "can't win" in Southeast Asia because it is white man confronting brown man. The Indonesian generals didn't care about that, and the Malaysians, like the South Vietnamese, had invited the protection of the white man.

Another myth is that the Westerners no longer can have any influence in Asia unless they get out. The British stayed.

It will not be easy for Malaysia in the future. This federation already has lost one of its important components, Singapore. Nor is it necessarily true that what happened in the southern island reaches of Southeast Asia will be repeated in the northern mainland area adjacent to China.

But the Malaysian experience does help to allay the sense of hopelessness about a Western intervention that has as its only aim the prevention of expansionism in the Chinese and North Viet Nam Communist style. The British experience shows that the line may be held by limited military methods, and that what President Johnson is talking about is not just belated justification for an ill-considered act.

The British experience effectively refutes the argument that the way to exercise power in Southeast Asia is to withdraw to the sea. If Britain had done that Sukarno would have been in North Borneo long since, and if we had done it in Viet Nam, Ho Chi Minh by now would have been in Saigon. The way to contain Chinese-style expansionism obviously is to remain on the scene.

Hardly any of the non-Marxist opponents of the Johnson Viet Nam policy oppose the containment of China. Most of them consider this to be necessary. The argument is over how best to do it within practical limitations.

The settlement in Malaysia also should make it easier for Britain to continue to exercise its power for stability in the Indian Ocean "east of Suez" by remaining ready to

give aid to threatened countries there, as it did for Malaysia.

These questions are much to the fore now, both in Washington and London. The problems involved are vital to American policy, for there is no desire in Washington to shoulder any burdens in the Indian Ocean area which Britain, or Britain's left wing, may wish to lay down.

It would be strange if, Britain having shown the way in Malaysia, we were now to abandon a policy proven wise.

WARSAW PACT STUDY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations, which I have the honor to chair, released an up-to-date study of the role of the Warsaw Pact in Soviet bloc affairs. I want to take this occasion to bring this study to the special attention of my colleagues.

In its current inquiry into alliance operations and the Atlantic Alliance, our subcommittee though it would be helpful to look closely at the Warsaw Pact, communism's counterpart to NATO. The 11-year-old Warsaw Pact is in a state of flux and ferment, and this timely study puts in perspective the dissident role of Rumania and the changing political scene of Eastern Europe.

This subcommittee study offers evidence that the Warsaw Pact is one of the few remaining effective devices available to Moscow for holding the Soviet bloc together at a time of growing economic pragmatism and more nationally oriented policy stands by the East European regimes. The East European governments, for their part, seem to regard the pact as surely that the U.S.S.R. will continue to underwrite their Communist regimes and safeguard their national boundaries.

On the military side, as the study indicates, the pact's East European armed forces have been modernized and standardized by the Soviets since 1961, and "meaningful military coordination among the armies of the signatories has advanced, so that Eastern European armed forces are a more useful adjunct to Soviet military power."

The subcommittee study offers further evidence, however, that the Soviet Union confronts some real problems with its East European allies. As the study indicates, these problems include:

Difficulty in persuading some allies to accept proportionate financial and other burdens entailed in Warsaw Pact commitments or to undertake larger pact commitments.

Difficulty in overriding dissenting members like Rumania by political pressure, since even countries willing to follow the Soviet line are reluctant to join in isolating more independent members in case they too should one day wish to pursue a path of their own choosing.

Pressure by East European members to have a greater voice in pact decisions, especially as a safeguard against involuntary involvement in nuclear war.

Disagreements over current pact organization and chain of command, and objections to Moscow's occupancy of all the major command posts under the pact.

Questions of reliability of forces of East European regimes under some circumstances if called upon to fight with the Soviet Union.

I believe this timely study can contribute to greater understanding of developments in the Soviet bloc and will be of special interest to officials of the government and private citizens concerned with problems of the Atlantic Alliance.

GENERAL HERSHHEY SUPPORTS STEP PROGRAM

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Milwaukee Journal of June 7, containing an interview with Gen. Lewis Hershey, Director of the National Selective Service, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced S. 3470, a bill which would provide special educational training and physical rehabilitation programs for men not now able to qualify for military service.

In the interview, General Hershey states:

We ought to make some who are unfit, fit. We ought not to put a premium on ignorance.

I wish to commend the general for supporting this measure. There are thousands of boys wanting to join the service, boys who are basically qualified to serve, but who are now rejected due to minor educational defects. It is estimated that between 11,000 and 15,000 men a year would benefit by this program.

These young men who want to volunteer would make excellent soldiers. They are highly motivated and would in all probability remain in the service as career soldiers. I am glad to know that the Director of the Selective Service agrees that something should be done to enable these young men to qualify for service.

ARMY SHOULD DRAFT, TRAIN UNFIT, GENERAL HERSHHEY SAYS

BALTIMORE, Md.—The educational standards for acceptance in military service "are too high for our long range needs," Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, national selective service director, said Monday.

"We ought to make some who are unfit, fit," he said. "We ought not to put a premium on ignorance."

Hershey advocated that the military services accept more illiterates and educate them.

"Do you mean the schools have failed?" Hershey was asked in an interview.

"Well, we are now turning down two and one-half million a year because they can't pass a simple test," he replied.

Hershey said in his opinion there were far too many exemptions from selective service. "How are you going to have democracy and fairness in a country where half of the people are not accepted?" he asked.

As for whether a military draft is necessary, Hershey said: "I never thought we had much choice. How can you survive in this world with your hands folded? A human being has to exert himself to survive."

INCREASE IN IMPORTS OF BUTTERFAT-SUGAR PRODUCTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the past several months there has been an alarmingly rapid increase in imports of butterfat-sugar products, containing 44 percent butterfat, 55 to 56 percent sugar, and possibly a trace of vanilla. This situation is hinted at in the May 1966 dairy situation report issued by the Department of Agriculture. But more recent information indicates that the situation is becoming serious.

Such mixtures, known under a variety of trade names such as Junex, Lorex, Ernex, and Grapex, have been imported for many years. More recently, 2.5 million pounds were imported in 1961, and 4.1 million pounds in 1962. But the levels have never been higher than that. There were no imports at all of this product during the 1963-64 or 1964-65 import years. But from July, 1965, through February of this year, 6 million pounds were imported. Since February the rate of increase has been sharp and rapid—3.1 million pounds were imported in March of 1966; 8.1 million pounds in April; and 19.5 million pounds in May. All told, through May of this year, imports of butterfat-sugar product has totaled roughly 36.6 million pounds. It is my understanding that in the first week of June about 1 million pounds came into the United States.

These imports constitute direct and serious competition with domestic sources of sugar and butterfat, and may be handled under existing law. If these imports are damaging the effectiveness of our price support programs for manufacturing milk and butterfat, or the attainment of the objectives of the Sugar Act, machinery exists to do something about it.

I have asked the Department of Agriculture today to intensify their examination and assessment of the situation with respect to these imports, in cooperation with other agencies that may be concerned. The Department of Agriculture is aware of the growing rate of imports. But I believe the situation is serious enough to justify full-scale review, together with beginning such action as may be warranted.

Since August of 1951, the United States has imposed import quotas on certain dairy commodities in order to protect the domestic price support programs for manufacturing milk and butterfat from excessive import interference. Among the specific dairy products subject to import limitations under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act are butter, dry milk, and Cheddar cheese.

In recent months, imports in products outside quota restrictions have been increasing. Among these ex-quota products are fresh-frozen cream, Colby cheese, and the "junextype" products containing less than 45 percent butterfat. Beginning in 1962, agreements between the United States and leading dairy export nations had limited trade in such commodities, but all of these agreements expired on June 30, 1965.

A number of complex and interrelated factors are causing these increases in butterfat-sugar product, principally the

high domestic price of butterfat and growing dairy supplies in other nations.

Under section 206 of the Sugar Act, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to limit importation of sugar-containing products if the importation will or does substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of the Sugar Act. It is hardly necessary to note that one of the fundamental purposes of the Sugar Act has been to promote within the United States the ability produce a substantial portion of our sugar requirements—for defense and strategic reasons, as well as consumer protection. Sugar is a vital food needed by American consumers, and the world supply of sugar has alternately been in very short supply or in surplus. Our sugar program has been intended to stabilize what have been very drastic changes in supply and demand, mostly in the last few years.

However, should action not be appropriate under section 206 of the Sugar Act, there is ample authority to proceed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That section provides that when the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article imported into the United States will render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with price support programs, he may recommend to the President that the U.S. Tariff Commission proceed to determine the existence of facts establishing the interference.

Interestingly enough, action has already been taken under this section. On April 15, 1957, President Eisenhower placed limitations, by Executive order, on the importation of butter substitutes, including butter oil, containing 45 percent or more of butterfat. This restriction would apply today to the butterfat-sugar product imports, except that the importers are careful to limit the amount of butterfat to 44 percent or less, thus escaping the quota. President Kennedy exercised this authority with respect to certain cotton products in September of 1961.

This situation is serious for Minnesota, since in both 1964 and 1965, Minnesota has led the Nation in the production of creamy butter, and has ranked among the three leading States in production of all milkfat.

Our dairy industry accounts for 22 to 23 percent of total cash receipts from farm marketings—about \$340 million annually. It is possible that our dairy industry, now suffering from an unusual decline, could be further crippled if the rate of increase in imports of butterfat-sugar products continues.

I intend to follow this situation closely, and cooperate closely with the Department of Agriculture in making the quickest possible assessment of the situation and in taking action if intensive investigation warrants placing some restrictions on these imports.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to understand why some of our colleagues manifest such a critical attitude toward the newly launched

war on poverty. From recent charges, one would conclude that this is the most ill conceived program ever enacted for our citizens. Furthermore, Sargent Shriver, the distinguished former Director of the Peace Corps and now the Director of the war on poverty, has been subjected to unfair personal attacks. In my opinion, and I am certain others in this body share similar views, Mr. Shriver is one of the most distinguished, dedicated, and inspired public servants ever to serve the U.S. Government.

Let us be fair in our evaluation of the war on poverty and recognize that it has been in existence less than 2 years. And, second, let us be fair in giving cognizance to several of its major accomplishments in this limited period of time.

It is remarkable that the Office of Economic Opportunity has approved over 3,850 grants to community action agencies covering over a third of all the counties in the United States; involved over 775,000 preschool children in Project Headstart, with an additional half million children scheduled to participate this summer; provided basic education and job training to 44,000 young men and women through the Job Corps; gained the participation of over 550,000 teenagers in the Neighborhood Youth Corps; selected, trained, and assigned over 2,100 VISTA volunteers to 278 rural and urban projects; benefited more than 120,000 unemployed adults through the work experience program; and has established other antipoverty measures, including adult basic education, rural loans and small business development loan programs, for groups chronically affected by the ravages of poverty.

Mr. President, instead of decrying every imaginary or legitimate shortcoming of this growing and dynamic program, I suggest that we should commend the Office of Economic Opportunity for the establishment of exciting, innovative concepts and programs—known to millions of Americans as Project Upward Bound, the legal services program, foster grandparents, medicare alert, and others—which have already produced gratifying results. The Headstart program has proved so popular that demand for local projects far exceeds available funds. Also significant are the special programs extended to long-forgotten groups such as migratory agricultural workers and American Indians which will enable them to join the mainstream of American life.

Admittedly, there have been problems, controversies, and occasional failures. But who could expect otherwise from the daring, new approaches to overcome the root causes of poverty in this Nation. Is it possible to embark upon such an approach, which permeates all levels of government and affects heretofore forgotten groups, many of whom are in the midst of great social unrest, without some difficulties arising? And is it possible to imagine a meaningful war on poverty, 18 months after its inception, being easy and comfortable and unanimously popular? Poverty has afflicted some portions of our society for generations. It is not likely to disappear in a single generation. But let us beware of

June 9, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080014-5

12143

Brazos Electric Power Cooperative: Hollis A. Dalton, Manager, 2404 Le Salle, Waco, Tex. Miss Margaret Walsworth, 2721 Herring Avenue, Waco, Tex.; Mr. Howard Gray III, 2901 Old Robinson Road, Waco, Tex.

Cap Rock Electric Cooperative: O. B. Bryan, Manager, Post Office Box 158, Stanton, Tex.; Miss Brenda Dyson, Post Office Box 631, Stanton, Tex.; Mr. Mike Springer, Post Office Box 38, Lenorah, Tex.

Central Texas Electric Cooperative: W. C. McWilliams, Manager, Post Office Box 553, Fredericksburg, Tex.; Miss Rebecca Hopson, Valley Spring Route, Llano, Tex.; Mr. Stephen Muttschink, Post Office Box 628, Mason, Tex.

Coleman County Electric Cooperative: C. L. Newton, Manager, Post Office Box 860, Coleman, Tex.; Miss Linda Kasbert, Post Office Box 124, Miles, Tex.; Mr. Ronnie Droll, Route 1, Box 92, Rowena, Tex.; Miss Cheryl Beck,¹ Post Office Box 296, Valera, Tex.

Comanche County Electric Cooperative: W. J. Parks, Manager, Post Office Box 553, Comanche, Tex.; Miss Martha Fanning, 1100 North Houston St., Comanche, Tex.; Mr. Troy Lee Hatcher, Jr., Post Office Box 292, Moran, Tex.

Deaf Smith County Electric Cooperative: Leo Forrest, Manager, Post Office Box 753, Hereford, Tex.; Miss Joyce Begner, Route 1, Hereford, Tex.; Mr. Jerry Alberant, Post Office Box 105, Nazareth, Tex.

Deep East Texas Electric Cooperative: D. N. Beasley, Manager, Post Office Drawer N, San Augustine, Tex.; Miss Susann Ramsey, Post Office Box 00, San Augustine, Tex.; Mr. Boyer Taylor, Post Office Box 135, Tenaha, Tex.

Denton County Electric Cooperative: Bill R. Collins, Manager, Post Office Box 699, Denton, Tex.; Miss Bobby Ann Thompson, Post Office Box 392, Frisco, Tex.; Mr. Jack Highfill, Post Office Box 194, Valley View, Tex.

DeWitt County Electric Cooperative: Fain McDougal, Manager, Post Office Box 231, Cuero, Tex.; Miss Claudia Arnold, Route 4, Yorktown, Tex.; Mr. Charles Mueller, Route 2, Box 25, Yorktown, Tex.

Dickens County Electric Cooperative: Lloyd Hindman, Manager, Post Office Box 1104, Spur, Tex.; Miss Gloria Moerno, Route 1, Box K1, Spur, Tex.; Mr. Larry Powell, Post Office Box 235, Spur, Tex.

Fayette Electric Cooperative: John F. Luecke, Manager, Post Office Box 298, La Grange, Tex.; Miss Barbara Miller, 1230 East Eblin Street, La Grange, Tex.; Miss Glenda Zappe,² 123 Kroschell Street, Hallettsville, Tex.; Mr. Robert Flikac,³ Route 1, Box 187, Shiner, Tex.; Mr. Marvin L. Moerbe, Route 1, La Grange, Tex.

Fannin County Electric Cooperative: J. W. Cunningham, Manager, Post Office Drawer 250, Bonham, Tex.; Miss Raylene Warnell, Route 1, Bonham, Tex.; Mr. Terry Brent, Route 2, Wolfe City, Tex.

Farmers Electric Cooperative: Joe Lytle, Manager, Post Office Box 1037, Greenville, Tex.; Miss Shirley King, 512 Lee Street, Sulphur Springs, Tex.; Mr. Danny Bonner, Jr., 914 N. Davis Street, Sulphur Springs, Tex.

Guadalupe Valley Electric Cooperative: O. W. Davis, Manager, Post Office Box 118, Gonzales, Tex.; Miss Jane Jahns, Route 2, Box 152, Marion, Tex.

Hall County Electric Cooperative: J. W. Coppedge, Manager, Post Office Box 1020, Memphis, Tex.; Miss Linda Simpson, 717 N. 16th Street, Memphis, Tex.; Mr. Royce Pigg, Star Route, Quisque, Tex.

J-A-C Electric Cooperative: James E. Fields, Manager, Post Office Box Drawer B, Bluegrove, Tex.; Miss Suzanne Lindeman, Post Office Box 24, Windthorst, Tex.; Mr. David Murray, Post Office Box 86, Byers, Tex.

Jasper-Newton Electric Cooperative: Troy

Mitchell, Manager, Post Office Drawer 430, Kirbyville, Tex.; Miss Betty Fillyaw, Post Office Box 81, Newton, Tex.; Mr. Rodney Van Horn, Route 3, Box 180, Kirbyville, Tex.

Lighthouse Electric Cooperative: Melvin Henry, Manager, Post Office Box 965, Floydada, Tex.; Miss Anne-Marie Conner, Route 3, Plainview, Tex.; Mr. Jerry Bigham, Post Office Box 813, Lockney, Tex.

Lone Wolf Electric Cooperative: James T. Hull, Manager, Post Office Box 793, Colorado City, Tex.; Miss Linda Wiggins, Route 3, Box 106, Snyder, Tex.; Mr. Dennis Grizzle, Post Office Box 224, Ira, Tex.

Lyntegar Electric Cooperative: Garland Pennington, Manager, Post Office Drawer A, Tahoka, Tex.; Miss Maria Bray, Post Office Box 638, Tahoka, Tex.; Mr. Richard White, Post Office Box 96 Tahoka, Tex.

McCulloch Electric Cooperative: B. C. Broad, Manager, Post Office Box 271, Brady, Tex.; Miss Vicki Gamblin, Route 1, Placid, Tex.; Mr. Terry Traweek, 900 North Bridge Street, Brady, Tex.

Magic Valley Electric Cooperative: Lee R. Gandy, Manager, Post Office Box 267, Mercedes, Tex.; Miss Claudia Bagley, Post Office Box 42, Rio Hondo, Tex.; Mr. Alan L. Johnson, Route 1, Santa Rosa, Tex.

Medina Electric Cooperative: James N. Myers, Manager, 2308 18th Street, Hondo, Tex.; Miss Jewelretta Keswick, 1415 North 7th Avenue, Crystal City, Tex.; Mr. John M. Seifert, Box 208, Route 1, Hondo, Tex.; Mr. Lyle Thomas Stein, Route 1, Box 66, Hondo, Tex.

Mid-South Electric Cooperative: Curtis F. Maynard, Manager, Post Office Box 822, Navasota, Tex.; Miss Becky Floyd, Route 2, Box 100, Navasota, Tex.; Mr. Jimmy Weaver, 204 Rotelle Street, Navasota, Tex.

Midwest Electric Cooperative: Johnny Ammons, Manager, Post Office Box 517, Roby, Tex.; Miss Dinah Lovett, Route 1, Rotan, Tex.; Mr. William Deknight, 2203 45th Street, Snyder, Tex.

Tri-County Electric Cooperative: W. C. Casparis, Jr., Manager, 600 N.W. Parkway, Azle, Tex.; Miss Gwendol Wood, Route 1, Box 111, Azle, Tex.; Mr. Charles Lewis, Route 1, Box 91H, Keller, Tex.; Mr. Russell Cotton, Route 1, Box 303, Mineral Wells, Tex.

Wharton County Electric Cooperative: K. A. Crawford, Manager, Post Office Box 911, El Campo, Tex.; Miss Michele Gibson, Post Office Box 1252, El Campo, Tex.; Mr. Arthur Keinarth, 810 Blue Creek Road, El Campo, Tex.

Wood County Electric Cooperative: V. B. Shaw, Manager, Post Office Box 398, Quitman, Tex.; Miss Quita Russell, Post Office Box 1802, Hawkins, Tex.; Mr. Steve Lacy, 404 North Pacific St., Mineola, Tex.

North Plains Electric Cooperative: Earl Walde, Manager, Post Office Box 550, Perryton, Tex.; Mr. Tom Zenor, Post Office Box 36, Higgins, Tex.

Pedernales Electric Cooperative: Mr. Tom Hutchinson, Assistant to President, Post Office Box 9032, Austin, Tex.; Miss Beth Barton, Post Office Box 236, Bertham, Tex.; Mr. Eric McKinney, Post Office Box 157, Johnson City, Tex.

Rita Blanca Electric Cooperative: Mr. E. L. Elliott, Jr., Manager, Post Office Box 990, Dalhart, Tex.; Miss Uszanne Dixon, Post Office Box 37, Morse, Tex.; Mr. Tommy Nisbett, 1405 Peach Avenue, Dalhart, Tex.

San Bernard Electric Cooperative: Mr. G. R. Schumann, Manager, Post Office Box 158, Bellville, Tex.; Miss Sandy Criswell, Post Office Box 254, Sheridan, Tex.; Miss Elizabeth Ilse, Route 2, Box 408, Columbus, Tex.; Mr. Francis Hagendorf, Post Office Box 276, Sheldon, Tex.

THE COMMERCIAL IMPORT PROGRAM IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there have been a number of newspaper arti-

cles recently about the problems which have developed in our commercial import program in Vietnam, carried out by our Agency for International Development. A particularly perceptive series has been written by Charles W. Bailey, correspondent for the Minneapolis Tribune and the Des Moines Register.

As Bailey points out, the objective of this program is to fight against rapid inflation in Vietnam, which can threaten stability, particularly in the cities, in a very serious way. Our increased involvement in Vietnam has inevitably generated unprecedented demands on the economy there, and by shipping a large number of goods there for commercial sale we hope to soak up excess buying power and keep prices down.

As one might expect in a program of this magnitude, there have been very serious problems. Chuck Bailey's analysis of these problems is worthy of the attention of the entire Senate, so I ask unanimous consent that several of his articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, May 7, 1966]
CZAR WILL PROBE PX BLACK MARKET IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Bailey, Minneapolis Tribune Staff Correspondent)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Defense Department, increasingly concerned over widespread black marketeering of military Post Exchange goods sent to South Viet Nam, has named a "czar" to investigate and where necessary clean up the situation.

Thomas D. Morris, assistant secretary of defense, has been named "Mr. Black Marketeer"—in the words of a Pentagon spokesman Friday—in an effort to clamp down on a problem that could cause the administration considerable embarrassment.

The thriving black market in PX goods is the most highly visible, though probably not the most serious, symptom of the theft, diversion and lack of control which have plagued United States military and foreign aid shipments to Viet Nam.

Diversion and theft of United States aid shipments, including goods purchased by Vietnamese businessmen with United States financing under the so-called Commodity Import Program (CIP), is under intensive investigation by civilian authorities, who have dispatched several dozen investigators to Saigon, South Viet Nam, in recent weeks.

Ironically, the Defense Department appointment of its own black market "czar" follows by less than three months the naming of a similar official by the South Vietnamese government at the insistence of President Johnson and other top U.S. leaders during the Honolulu conference.

It has been no secret in Saigon that the influx of PX supplies for U.S. troops has fed a thriving black market. Sidewalk vendors there offer radios, liquor, canned food, cigarettes, clothing, bedsheets and other items—many bearing Post Exchange price tags—for sale in hundreds of open-air booths.

The PX black market drew fire this week from Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a persistent critic of the war in Viet Nam.

FULBRIGHT said that "30,000 containers of hair spray were sent to Viet Nam in March... it seems reasonable to suppose that this item has found its way to the black market."

Anyone walking down Saigon sidewalks can confirm that hair spray is a popular item

¹ Miss Beck jointly sponsored by Group IV Managers.

² Co-sponsored by Fayette, Guadalupe Valley and San Bernard Electric Cooperatives.

June 9, 1966

in the open-air black market. But FULBRIGHT, according to highly knowledgeable official sources, seriously understated the magnitude of the shipments.

Shipments of hair spray to South Viet Nam—destined for PX counters but often diverted to sidewalk stalls—have been running at a level of more than 140,000 containers a month for the past four or five months, these sources say.

There are fewer than 800 women in all of South Viet Nam authorized to purchase goods in U.S. Post Exchanges, the sources say—nurses, dependents of non-government U.S. personnel with PX privileges, and a handful of Vietnamese dependents of military men.

Thus the monthly consignments of hair spray would provide close to 200 cans of hair spray per month for each woman authorized to obtain it. The fact is that hair spray is a standard gift for GIs to give to their Vietnamese girl friends.

A Defense Department spokesman confirmed yesterday that Morris had been given the black market "czar" assignment by Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance. The spokesman said that Vance acted after receiving "some reports" on the situation following his recent inspection trip to Vietnam.

The spokesman said Vance also has ordered each service secretary—Army, Navy and Air Force—to give him a monthly report on actions taken by them to curb black marketeering, currency dealings, and similar illegal activities.

Morris, who is assistant secretary of defense for manpower, was chosen by Vance because his responsibilities cut across interservice lines, the spokesman said.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, May 10, 1966]

TEAM SEEKS TO END VIET MISUSE (By Charles Bailey, of the Register's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Foreign aid officials, spurred by evidence of major misuse of American aid to South Viet Nam, are hastily increasing their efforts to control the nearly \$500 million worth of U.S.-financed goods shipped each year to Saigon.

An entire new 27-man "special projects team" has been set up in the U.S. aid mission headquarters in Saigon, along with extra auditors and inspectors, in an effort to prevent further diversion of aid shipments by profiteering merchants or agents of the Communist Viet Cong.

The stepped-up policing efforts of the Agency for International Development (AID), which handles economic assistance programs, parallel the action of the Defense Department, which has appointed a "czar" to crack down on black marketing in military post exchange goods and currency.

The military and civilian enforcement drive apparently resulted, at least in part, from investigations conducted in recent weeks by the Inspector-General's office of the State Department. This office has formal policing authority only over the AID programs, but in addition has pointed up black marketeering activities in military PX supplies as well.

It was the curiosity of an official in the Inspector-General's office that resulted in the interception of 50 tons of a highly-explosive chemical compound bound for Saigon. The compound had been purchased by a Vietnamese importer—Reportedly for use in making rubber-soled tennis shoes—under a program financed by AID.

COMPLICATED NAME

The inspector's curiosity as to the apparent huge demand for tennis shoes, plus the complicated chemical name of the compound, led to his initial inquiry, subsequent tests by the Naval Ordnance Laboratory

showed the compound—trade-named "Unicel-100" and known chemically as "dinitroso-pentamethane tetramine"—to be almost as powerful as TNT.

A similar, though less lethal, item recently turned back from its Saigon destination was its Saigon destination was \$1-million-worth of silver nitrate. It was questioned, and then canceled, because it seemed likely to have been purchased as a "money maker"—a nonessential import designed solely for the enrichment of the importer.

Silver nitrate can be melted down—"in the back of any shack," as one official put it—and it yields half of its original weight in pure silver.

Because the financing arrangements under the U.S.-backed Commodity Import Program (CIP) allow a Vietnamese importer to buy goods at an exchange of 60 piastres to the dollar, instead of the going black-market rate of 180 to 200 piastres per dollar now prevalent in Saigon, the potential for profit in such a manipulation is large.

Even if half the silver nitrate is lost in the conversion process, the importer would be left with a tidy profit when he sold his solid silver, in the form of ashtrays or spoons, on the Saigon market.

In addition, conversion of the unstable piastre into something as "hard" and thus stable as silver, particularly at a low pegged piastre price, gives a Vietnamese a chance to enrich himself in real, inflation-proof terms.

TARGET OF DEMANDS

According to an AID spokesman, the agency has been the target in the last few days of demands from both Congress and the White House for details of past losses and future control plans. The White House inquiries, the spokesman said, had become especially insistent, and he added: "There seems to be a real flap over this."

As for Congress, a House subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat of California, arrived in Saigon last weekend to look into the diversion problem. It carries a special agreement giving it authority to probe military as well as AID programs.

The AID agency Monday was unable to provide specific information on the new tougher program of "end-use" auditing—that is, the checking of goods sent to Viet Nam under the CIP program to determine whether they have been used for the purposes stated in the import application.

But an AID spokesman did provide this run-down on the new control measures being instituted:

A "special projects team," consisting of 20 AID officials and seven experts from the U.S. Bureau of Customs, has been set up in Saigon to see what happens to shipments after they arrive. This team will be strengthened by another 10 men within two months.

Two additional "management inspectors"—empowered to call for records on any transaction—have been assigned to Saigon to join the two already there.

Five additional staff auditors have been assigned to the Saigon AID Mission to join the 13 already there, and another 17 auditors are to be added "as soon as possible."

The AID spokesman added that one or the other of the two top officials of the Inspector-General's office—Director Kenneth Mansfield and his deputy, Howard E. Haugerud—has been in Saigon "most of the time" in recent weeks, investigating the situation.

Since there are about 375 employees in the U.S. AID Mission in Saigon, the current 47-man complement of inspectors, investigators and auditors amounts to about one person in eight in the mission. When the additional policing personnel now planned arrive, the proportion will be nearly one in five—a measure of the gravity with which the problem is now viewed.

[From the Des Moines Register, May 14, 1966]
FEAR REDS GOT U.S. EXPLOSIVE—SEE POSSIBLE USE BY VIET TERRORISTS—CHEMICAL WAS SENT TO PRIVATE FIRMS

(By Charles Bailey, of the Register's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—At least 100 tons of a highly explosive chemical compound were delivered to private merchants in South Viet Nam under U.S. aid programs before suspicious investigators discovered its potential value to Communist terrorists.

The agency for International Development, (AID), which administers the economic assistance program under which the chemical was shipped, is now trying to find out whether the compound—purportedly imported to Saigon for use in making rubber-soled tennis shoes—was diverted to the Viet Cong. It is suspected that it was.

AUDIT ORDERED

An "end-use" audit has been ordered on the 100 tons of Unicel-100 and Unicel-DN—two variants of the same compound. They were shipped before State Department inspectors learned of the compound's explosive properties last month.

In addition to the 100 tons, an AID spokesman said Friday that undetermined additional amounts were purchased by Vietnamese merchants, with U.S. financing, from manufacturers in Japan and Formosa.

Tests of Unicel-100, made after an official of the State Department Inspector-General's Office questioned a 50-ton shipment, revealed the compound to be nearly as powerful an explosive as T.N.T. A single pound, packed into a bicycle hand-pump and simply fused, could wreck a building, officials said.

(The most recent terrorist blast in Saigon reportedly was caused by a bomb attached to a bicycle.)

The 50-ton shipment of Unicel was stopped in mid-ocean. But the 100 tons shipped under earlier authorizations already had arrived in Saigon and had been picked up by the merchants who bought it under the AID Commodity Import Program, which finances purchases—at a favorable rate of exchange—by Vietnamese businessmen.

The program subsidized the import of goods, with the aim of providing materials needed to strengthen the economy of South Viet Nam without feeding the inflation that recently has become a major problem there.

But recent investigations, such as the one that turned up shipments of Unicel so large they obviously were not for the stated purpose of making tennis shoe soles more flexible and springy, have indicated widespread misuse and diversion of U.S.-financed goods.

Such misuse involves not only diversion of goods to the Communists—as suspected in the case of the Unicel and such other materials as drugs, steel and cement—but also its conversion in "Money-making" projects—such as the melting down of silver nitrate into pure silver for hoarding or resale.

AID spokesmen said Friday that the list of specific "end-use" audits ordered in the current crackdown is classified because the agency does not want it known which items are being checked. But they said that both Unicel and silver nitrate are among the commodities being checked.

A spokesman said he was "sure" that no more Unicel would be authorized for shipment to South Viet Nam regardless of the audit findings. As for silver nitrate, he suggested that the current stop order would be maintained until investigations are complete.

The discovery of such incidents as the Unicel shipment, plus increasing congressional concern over the operation of the Commodity Import Program, have resulted in a drastic step-up in auditing and policing procedures.

But the task of checking the \$420 million in goods shipped under the program in the

June 9, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400080014-5

12145

last two years, and of preventing misuse of the equal amount programmed for the next 12 months, will keep auditors busy for weeks or even months, officials say.

Special emphasis will be put on checks of so-called "critical" goods—materials which would be of special use to the Communists. In addition to drugs—especially antibiotics—this list includes chemicals, small hand tools and such machine tools as lathes which can be used in making arms.

Of the \$870 million in goods being shipped this year under the Commodity Import Program, almost \$71 million is industrial machinery and equipment. Chemicals and pharmaceuticals account for another \$43 million. Iron and steel products shipped this year are valued at \$72 million, while motor vehicles and parts are listed at \$18 million.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, May 14, 1966]

INFLATION COULD WIPE OUT ALL GAINS IN VIETNAM

(By Charles W. Bailey, Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Behind the furore over black marketeering, currency manipulation and diversion of United States financed aid in Viet Nam lies one central concern: The fear that rampant inflation could wipe out every bit of dearly-bought economic and political progress in that shaky nation.

Inflation is traditionally a problem for developing nations, where each economic advance may trigger a rise in demand that outstrips the capacity to meet it. It is doubly troublesome in Viet Nam because of the huge impact of American military and war-connected spending there.

The piastre, South Viet Nam's currency unit, has so weakened in recent months that it is now valued on the free market in Saigon at more than 180 to the dollar—compared to official exchange rates ranging down to 60 to the dollar for some American-financed official transactions.

The big United States build-up has made an already bad situation worse. American contractors pay wages to construction workers well above local scales. American military personnel, diplomats, correspondents and others bid up the scale of rents in Saigon.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars in United States military pay is dumped each month into the economy, sending consumer goods prices sky-high for already hard-pressed Vietnamese.

Not all the inflation can be traced to United States spending. The build-up of Vietnamese armed forces required bigger government outlays—without comparable revenue increases.

Transportation and communications were cut back by the war, thus hindering production at the very time when more was needed. A manpower shortage brought repeated wage increases as employers bid for scarce help.

With the piastre thus reeling under the impact of American spending, it is not hard to see why some Vietnamese businessmen find it attractive to manipulate United States aid programs.

A merchant who can buy a dollar's worth of silver nitrate for a "pegged" price of 6 piastres, melt it down and sell the resulting silver for upwards of 200 piastres has an automatic profit, even after the shrinkage involved in processing.

And if he chooses to hold onto the silver, he has an inflation-proof asset which can be sold for hard currency at any time—whether in Saigon or in some other country to which he has taken his silver in the form of spoons or bullion.

The political effects of inflation can also be disastrous. Saigon's middle class population—the civil servants, teachers and professionals who must be counted on to play

a major role in any real national government—is progressively impoverished by inflation.

Their fixed salaries are worth less each month. They must not only compete for decent living space with the Americans but must pay more and more for it as prices go up. The cost of food, clothing, fuel, transportation—of everything—goes up.

The best simple measure of the impact of inflation is one statistic: In 1965, after some years of relative stability, consumer prices rose about 40 per cent in one year. And in some remote areas and refugee-crowded centers, prices doubled during the year.

Fighting this inflation has a high priority in the Johnson administration's over-all economic aid program for Viet Nam. The United States is financing \$870 million worth of commodity imports this year and will pay for another \$420 million worth in the coming fiscal year.

But some officials here believe that even these massive efforts are not enough. "I spent time in China after World War II," one expert said, "and I watched inflation wreck that country's economy. I'm afraid the same thing could happen in Viet Nam, and wash out everything we've done or hope to do."

This official, and some others like him, believe the ambitious plans for social and economic development which grew out of the Honolulu conference, while certainly desirable, may not be necessary as immediate objectives—at last not imperative in comparison with the greater need to choke off inflation.

The attempt to produce the "social revolution" proclaimed at Hawaii, some officials suggest, is like "trying to attach a garden hose to a fire hydrant" because Saigon's resources of time, energy and export manpower are so limited that it cannot fight a war, curb inflation and also carry out the added new tasks.

It is certain that the inflation problem is at the heart of many of this week's meetings between Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his Washington superiors. It is also at the root of the stepped-up effort to control the ultimate use of the millions of dollars worth of U.S. goods being sent to Saigon.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, May 20, 1966]

VIETCONG GETS SOME MATERIAL—U.S. BOOSTS GUARD OVER AID GOODS

(By Charles W. Bailey, Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The head of the United States foreign aid program conceded Thursday that controls over shipments to Viet Nam have been "inadequate" and that some supplies have wound up in the hands of the Communist Viet Cong.

David Bell, administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID), said in an interview that the administration has "added greatly" to the number of officials in Saigon charged with overseeing the AID program and will "more than double" existing watchdog personnel.

As a result of newly revealed evidence of major misuse of United States-financed goods sent to South Viet Nam, an entire new 27-man "special projects team" has been set up in Saigon. Another 25 or more inspectors and auditors are to be added to this force soon, AID spokesmen said.

The stepped-up policing of AID shipments—sent to Saigon under a commodity import program now running at a \$420 million annual level—parallels action by the Defense Department, which recently appointed a "czar" to crack down on black marketeering in post exchange goods and currency.

The degree of the military crackdown remained unclear yesterday despite Defense Department statements that 41 servicemen and 70 civilians have been punished or in-

vestigated for black marketing.

A defense spokesman said that the totals cover an 18-month period, and he said that the civilian cases "remain under investigation" with no punitive action taken so far.

Bell's comments in a television interview gave only a partial picture of the step-up in AID policing activity. He said that 18 Americans are working "full-time" to oversee the program in Saigon, and that this number will be more than doubled.

Bell thus appeared to be referring only to auditors, who are primarily engaged in following through on delivery records to determine what happened to goods sent to Saigon under a program in which the U.S. government finances imports by changing Vietnamese piastres into U.S. dollars at a pegged rate of 60 to 1, far below the free-market exchange rate of 180 to 1.

Actually, the auditors—many of them newly assigned to Saigon—are only part of the check-up team sent there since recent investigations by State Department inspectors focused attention on abuses.

In addition, the 27-man "special projects team," including seven experts from the U.S. Bureau of Customs, has been put to work on the problem, and two additional "management inspectors" with broad investigatory power have been assigned to the Saigon AID mission.

AID spokesmen say that another 10 men are to be added to the "special projects" group within two months, while at least 17 more auditors are scheduled to be dispatched to Saigon as soon as they can be recruited.

Bell explained the possibility of diversion of United States-financed goods to the Communists in this way:

"When the goods have been delivered to the businessman to whom they were supposed to go open and aboveboard, then they are available in the markets, in the shops, in the stores in Saigon and other parts of Viet Nam.

"Then they may be purchased by someone who is really acting for the Viet Cong and they may be smuggled through the lines, so to speak—as you know, there isn't any front line in Viet Nam—out to the Viet Cong in their jungle bases."

Bell conceded that "to some extent" charges that United States-financed concrete was being used by the Viet Cong to build tunnels in its jungle redoubts were true.

Cement, he said, could be purchased in Saigon by a Viet Cong agent and smuggled into the jungle. "We haven't adequate data to answer the question of how much of this there is," he said.

To counter this diversion, Bell said, a "major police program," including road blocks, control points on waterways and other checkpoints is being developed.

[From the Des Moines Register, May 24, 1966]
How U.S. AID FOR VIET GOES TO RED TAXES—
REVEAL HEAVY LOSS OF GOODS

(By Charles Bailey, of the Register's
Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—State Department investigators have uncovered substantial losses of U.S. foreign aid goods being shipped to out-lying points in Viet Nam—apparently through outright theft by haulers or in the form of taxes exacted by the Communist Viet Cong.

The losses—which include cement, aluminum sheet roofing and food—ranged from 18 to 42 per cent of shipments leaving central depots in Saigon, according to spot checks made in seven South Vietnamese provinces.

This latest disclosure of trouble in massive American aid to Viet Nam came in an unpublicized report by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

June 9, 1966

The report also cited a number of other examples of problems in Viet Nam which have been brought to light by the department's inspector general's office. These included black marketeering, currency manipulation, opium smuggling and questionable administration of a variety of aid programs.

CHECKS BY U.S.

While previous revelations have pointed up the looseness of controls in programs involving private Vietnamese merchants who receive goods under U.S. aid programs, the details of intransit losses revealed Monday indicate similar problems in direct government-operated aid efforts as well.

More than a year ago, the inspector general's office—charged with overseeing all U.S. aid programs—ran checks on commodities being shipped from Saigon to provincial towns under the so-called counter-insurgency program.

Rusk reported to the Senate committee that the probbers "developed figures showing apparent significant discrepancies between the amounts of commodities leaving Saigon and the amounts arriving in the provinces."

Specific figures, not included in Rusk's report, tell the story more vividly.

Investigators checked records to find out how much cement, aluminum sheeting, wheat and vegetable oil were shipped in one year from central warehouses in Saigon to An Xuyen Province, in the Mekong Delta near the Cambodian border.

REVEAL LOSSES

They then checked provincial records in An Xuyen to find out how much was delivered, allowing for truck and barge shipments known to have been captured outright by the Communist Viet Cong between the national and provincial capitals.

The results of the check showed these figures:

Of 9,000 bags of cement shipped and not seized by the Viet Cong outright, only 7,367 bags reached the provincial warehouse—a loss of 1,633 bags, or 18.1 per cent.

Of 26,793 gallons of vegetable oil shipped from Saigon, only 15,446 gallons were checked into the provincial warehouse—a loss of 11,347 gallons, or 42.3 per cent, with a value of \$24,800.

Of 8,020 bags of wheat that left Saigon, only 6,363 reached the An Xuyen warehouse—a loss of 1,657 bags, or 20.7 per cent, with a value of \$18,740.

Of 7,938 sheets of aluminum roofing material shipped from Saigon, only 6,843 arrived in the province—a loss of 1,445 sheets, or 18.2 per cent.

Officials said that similar spot-checks in six other provinces yielded comparable statistics. There are 43 provinces in South Viet Nam, so the total loss through this kind of diversion was obviously substantial.

Those familiar with the investigation said Monday that two factors undoubtedly accounted for most of the losses between Saigon and the provinces—either outright theft or taxes by the Viet Cong as the price of allowing the transporters to proceed in safety.

[From the Des Moines Register, May 25, 1966]

BID TO BUILD VIET BREWERY WITH U.S. AID—BUT OFFICIAL BLOCKED \$4-MILLION PLANT

(By Charles Bailey, of the Register's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. officials in Saigon sought to finance the operations of a private Vietnamese brewery with \$4 million in American funds under a foreign aid program intended to provide only "essential" goods, official reports revealed Tuesday.

The proposed transaction was stopped by the State Department's inspector general, who refused to allow the use of U.S. dollars for importing malt and hops to be used in making beer.

Details of the case, obtained by The Des Moines Register Tuesday, provide new examples of the confusion and lack of controls which have plagued U.S. aid efforts in Viet Nam.

The malt-hops case also illustrates another problem plaguing U.S. foreign aid programs—the difficulty of persuading American aid officials to seek ways of utilizing the huge and still-growing amounts of local currencies piled up in various nations as payment for American food shipments.

The Vietnamese malt-hops issue arose in 1965 when officials in the U.S. aid mission in Saigon asked Washington for a waiver of rules limiting the outlay of aid funds under the so-called Commodity Import Program (CIP) to "essential" goods.

ARTIFICIALLY LOW

[Under the CIP, private Vietnamese businessmen receive goods purchased here with government dollars. They pay for the goods with Vietnamese piastres, at an artificially low rate of exchange.

[The piastres are then used in Viet Nam on joint U.S.-Vietnamese government projects, so the cost of the goods shipped under CIP is fully borne by U. S. public funds.]

The inspector general's office, in the State Department—charged with checking the operation of all overseas U.S. assistance programs—questioned the waiver application on several grounds.

First, it saw no reason to waive the essential-goods-only rule for a project involving the production of beer.

Second, it found the proposal objectionable on the ground that malt and hops were commodities which have to be imported into the U. S. to meet the full needs of brewers here. Thus the transaction would have further increased net import requirements in the United States and would thus tend to worsen our balance-of-payments problem.

FIVE-MILLION-DOLLAR CREDIT

Third, the inspector general pointed out that South Vietnamese officials already had available a \$5 million credit from West Germany, an exporter of the desired goods, but had not drawn on that credit.

Fourth, the inspector general pointed out that the United States owned about \$250 million worth of Yugoslavian currency, as a result of Food-for-Peace sales to that nation, and that this might be used to purchase the malt and hops, since Yugoslavia is an exporter of the commodities.

Official sources here said Tuesday that the inspector general sought to persuade aid officials in Washington to explore these alternate methods of financing, but that the aid officials refused and continued to press for a waiver that would permit use of U.S. dollars under CIP.

But the inspector general again refused the waiver, and this time provided the required written notice to the secretary of state which made the refusal final.

The upshot, informed sources said, was that the Vietnamese financed the malt-hops imports out of their own foreign exchange resources rather than using U.S. aid funds to pay for them.

According to official sources here, the case—despite the action of the inspector general in preventing a \$4 million U.S. outlay to pay for beer production—points up several problems.

INDIANA'S SECOND NATIONAL MEMORIAL—GEORGE ROGERS CLARK AT VINCENNES

M.R. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to my bill, S. 2886, the George Rogers Clark Memorial bill, upon which the Senate Interior Committee has concluded hearings. June 7 the

House unanimously passed H.R. 9599, the companion bill introduced by my own Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, Eighth District, Indiana.

I ask unanimous consent to include my testimony on S. 2886 in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR VANCE HARTKE ON S. 2886, GEORGE ROGERS CLARK MEMORIAL, SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE, JUNE 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to appear before your Committee. I want to express my appreciation for your willingness to act so swiftly for the creation of Indiana's second National Memorial.

We Hoosiers have great pride in our historical heritage which includes the names of George Rogers Clark, William Henry Harrison and Abraham Lincoln, as well as many others.

S. 2886 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept from the State of Indiana the George Rogers Clark Memorial at the historic site on the Wabash River, now the city of Vincennes, and enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of other historical buildings.

One of these properties is the two-room frame building which served as the first capitol of the Indiana Territory and as the seat of the territorial court from 1800-1813 where many decisions on land policy, Indian relations and military affairs were determined.

Another of the properties is the Francis Xavier Catholic Church. The present building dates from 1824-1834 and is in the same tract of ground on which, in 1749 was erected the first rough log cabin church to serve the French and Spanish settlers when Vincennes was the western outpost of our country. At that time, this western outpost was Fort Sackville, a British Fort until 1779 when Lt. Colonel George Rogers Clarke captured and renamed it Fort Patrick Henry.

Grouseland, the home of William Henry Harrison, is the third property which we had hoped to include. It is owned by the Daughters of the American Revolution, who, I am informed, do not wish it to be part of the National Memorial. However, they have assured the House Committee by telegram that the building will remain open to the public and that the D.A.R. will continue to maintain it. I would like for their telegram to become part of this record.

I urge that the Committee favorably consider S. 2886 so that the area of Vincennes, which is so beautifully depicted by Maurice Thompson's novel, Alice of Old Vincennes, can be elevated as it should be, to national recognition. I appreciate the overwhelming passage by the House of Representatives of the George Rogers Clark Memorial bill, and congratulate my own Congressman, WINFIELD K. DENTON, for his fine work in guiding the measure through the House.

I would like to say a few more words about Vincennes, in Knox County, Indiana.

The George Rogers Clark Memorial is a domed structure supported by 17 Doric columns. It contains a bronze statue of Clark and murals depicting his career and the history of the old Northwest Territory. This Memorial was first dedicated by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1936.

It was at Vincennes that the Lincoln family, with young Abe, crossed over the Wabash River into Illinois. Vincennes is the point at which the proposed Lincoln Trail National Parkway crosses into Illinois toward Springfield. This proposed National Parkway originates at the Lincoln birthplace in Hodgenville, Kentucky, and passes through the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in Spencer County, Indiana. I mention the Lincoln Trail National Parkway for I am certain the Interior Department, as well as

June 9, 1966

ALL OVER AGAIN WITH CHINA?

Having gone through a 20-year cold war and arms race with the Soviet Union at great cost and danger, must the United States now face an equally irrational cold war and arms race with Communist China? Secretaries Rusk and McNamara sounded as if they thought so when, in Paris recently, they undertook to scare the NATO powers with visions of a (some day) nuclear-armed China embarked on a course of world conquest.

The fright treatment will not work, we think, in Europe. The important question is whether it will work in the United States. Sober reflection on the history of the cold war to date ought to convince Americans that it would be greatly to our advantage if we avoided making with China the same mistakes we made with Russia.

There is little doubt that the cold war had its origins in the long effort of the United States and other powers, beginning in 1918-19, to throttle or isolate Soviet Russia.

At the end of World War I the United States, Britain, France and Poland sent troops into Russia on a mission that could only be interpreted, inside Russia, as an attempt to overthrow the Communist revolution. When armed intervention failed, the United States for 16 years refused to recognize Red Russia, treating the new regime as an outcast from the world community and declining to enter into meaningful diplomatic or economic relations with it. (Interesting note: For just 16 years now we have been declining to recognize Communist China, treating that government as an outcast from the world community and declining to enter into meaningful diplomatic or economic relations with it.)

The Russians, of course, never forgot the Western World's hostility to their revolution. They were further embittered when the West at Munich sacrificed Czechoslovakia to Hitler, in the hope of directing Nazi aggression against Russia to save itself. Hitler wound up fighting both the West and Russia, and their wartime alliance gave birth to hopes of a new era of cooperation.

It was not to be. Almost overnight, President Truman reversed the Roosevelt policy and set out to "contain" Communism by interposing American influence and military power in Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Middle East. Then, as now with China, the assumption was that Russia was bent on world conquest. What Russia was bent on, it has become clear, was protecting her borders while she rapidly developed her own society. In general, Russia succeeded. And it is now also clear that the strongest barrier to Russian national expansion is the national identity of neighboring states which, even under Communist governments, resist absorption and seek peaceful relations with both East and West.

One frequently hears that the United States is doing in Viet Nam what it did in Greece under the Truman Doctrine—building a barrier of armed power against a Communist tide rolling on toward world conquest; and it is assumed that our stand in Greece triumphed. The truth is we might be engaged there yet had not Tito closed the Communist supply route after falling out with Stalin. In other words, what saved Greece was not primarily our military and economic power but the indigenous nationalism of Communist Yugoslavia.

The one great lesson of the cold war with Russia is that national interests, and not Communist ideology, are controlling on both sides. The Russians, like the Chinese, have talked a lot about their revolution some day embracing the world, but at the critical points they have invariably acted in behalf of Russian interests rather than of Marxist dogma.

National interests can be accommodated, when the will to reconcile them exists on both sides. By and large, the United States

and Russia have learned after 20 years of cold war that their conflicts must be reconciled—that in the nuclear age neither can undertake an ideological war against the other. Only the Viet Nam issue stands in the way of a steady improvement in relations that would, in effect, end the cold war with Russia.

Can we not apply these lessons of the past to our future with China? Must we go through another period of ideological conflict in which vast portions of our national energies are devoted to military power at the expense of our social and cultural development?

We must now possess, many times over, the military power necessary to defend ourselves and to deter overt aggression anywhere. It would be a national tragedy if, nevertheless, we embarked on a new nuclear arms race and a series of peripheral wars designed to "contain" Chinese Communism by military encirclement. Ideas cannot be so contained. Revolutions cannot be permanently suppressed with guns. Not all revolutions are against our national interest. We cannot impose our will everywhere, and we defeat our purposes by trying. The way to meet Communist boasts of coming world revolution is not to believe them, but to help free peoples create the conditions that make Communist impossible.

Just as we have learned at great cost and hazard to live at peace with Russia, we shall some day have to make up our minds to accept Red China's existence, to respect her legitimate interests, to meet her challenge by other means than military containment. It would be the part of wisdom to make this decision before, rather than after, another 20 years of cold war and arms race. Mankind may not get a second chance to avoid nuclear suicide.

DECEMBER 19, 1965.

UN
FISCAL BRINKSMANSHIP IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as the war in Vietnam grows in scope and complexity, and as more and more of our national treasure is spent every day to maintain our position in that troubled country, we find ourselves calling upon the elder statesmen of our Nation for their views on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

None of these is more able or proven than Ferdinand Eberstadt. A man who served his country well during the dark days of World War II and the postwar period, Mr. Eberstadt was recently asked his opinion of the American position in Vietnam by the New York economist and columnist, Eliot Janeway.

Mr. Eberstadt's comments are frank and to the point, and offer two alternative courses of action the United States can take in Vietnam. I think his views are well worth the consideration of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Janeway's interview of Ferdinand Eberstadt may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Apr. 21, 1966]

POINT OF VIEW—JANEWAY EXAMINES TWO STICKS TO TRY IN VIETNAM

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, April 21.—Clearly, American opinion can't remake the map of Asia in its own image. Recent Washington dogma about Asia is at a discount. Pragmatic ap-

proaches are at a premium. Accordingly, this column consulted one of America's elder statesmen, financier Ferdinand Eberstadt. It was he who fathered world War II's definitive plan of industrial mobilization; who collaborated with the late great James Forrestal in modernizing our defense apparatus; and who chaired the Hoover commission task force on national security.

Eberstadt began by reading from this early cold war report: "Victory by bankruptcy may be the Machiavellian aim of the Kremlin. Whether or not any such deliberate campaign can be attributed to Moscow, it is absolutely clear that the United States faces in the immediate future no sudden relaxation of tension, but a continuation of recurrent crises. If this be so, the fiscal dangers of tomorrow are clearly visible."

JANEWAY. Has the crisis in Viet Nam involved us in an exercise in fiscal brinkmanship?

EBERSTADT. Definitely—and its beginning to get ahead of us. When you use money for productive purposes, you don't get inflation. You get inflation when you use money unproductively—as in war. Then everybody's costs go up and real earnings and savings go down.

JANEWAY. Can emergency taxes and controls hold the line?

CAN TAXES HELP?

EBERSTADT. Not for long. But when once a society puts a stop to unproductive expenditures, the inflationary fever cures itself.

JANEWAY. Will the fiscal score be toted up by the way we play the game in Viet Nam?

EBERSTADT. I'm just a stuffed shirt Wall street Republican, and L. B. J. is a master politician from Main street. But I hate to see him try to climb up the side of a fog bank. That's what we've been doing out there—and with no social structure to grasp onto. The way things are now, if we should win, we lose as white imperialists; while if we are beaten, we are just plain punks.

JANEWAY. How do we work our way out of this bind?

EBERSTADT. To make the other fellow sit down and talk, you must show him that he has something to lose if he doesn't. Now, the enemy has nothing to lose. We have committed ourselves not to threaten the big fellows on the other side. Why should they negotiate? Our policy is exhausting our own resources. The other side has made pretty good progress with its plan or we wouldn't be talking about inflation today.

WHAT'S OUR STICK?

JANEWAY. Before you can get a mule to do what you say, you must first catch his attention with a stick. What's our stick?

EBERSTADT. We have two. The first is Gen. James M. Gavin's enclave idea. We dig in to our readily defensible positions on the mainland: let the present political fuss settle down; and sit in what the late Secretary John Foster Dulles used to speak of as "a situation of strength." Enclaves would free us from the charge of being white imperialists. We could use waiting time, as Senator RICHARD RUSSELL (D., Ga.) says, to make an agonizing reappraisal of the difference between "face" and our own national interest. The basic objective of our national interest is the security of our people—not a world-wide crusade for democracy in behalf of nonbelievers.

JANEWAY. You suggested another stick.

EBERSTADT. It's riskier than the enclave idea, but less risky than what we're doing now and it's waiting for us in Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek is certainly no worse than those fellows we have on our hands in Viet Nam. Ever since he lost China, we have been giving him our best and most advanced fighting equipment. We have offered to arm other allies who shun us. We have already armed this satellite. Members of Congress of both parties and all points of view

June 9, 1966

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 9, 1966]

THE CONTAINMENT OF IDEAS

(Note.—The three leading editorials on this page were cited by the Advisory Board on the Pulitzer Prizes, Columbia University, in awarding the Pulitzer Prize for distinguished editorial writing in 1965 to Robert Lasch, Editor of the Editorial Page of the Post-Dispatch.)

Coming events in South Viet Nam promise for many Americans a profound psychological shock, which a farsighted Administration would be preparing to offset. When the day comes for American forces to leave Viet Nam after 10 years of vain effort to build an anti-Communist bastion there, not only will our national pride be hurt, but some basic assumptions of our postwar foreign policy will be called into question. As fresh thinking is always more painful than mouthing shibboleths, this is going to cause a certain degree of anguish.

Unpleasant as it may be, the time for reappraisal has come, and thoughtful Americans should resolve to be realistic about it. The first step is to cast off the illusion of omnipotence, under the spell of which many of us have for years assumed that our mission in the world is to contain, roll back, destroy or otherwise combat Communism.

After World War II, the Soviet Union sought to expand its national power wherever possible. The United States, as the leader of the free world, was thoroughly justified in undertaking to contain that thrust, and it was contained. Only where the Red Army stood on land taken from the Nazis—which is to say, only in Eastern Europe—were the Russians able to impose their national will on other peoples; and the passage of time has indicated that even there, subjugation is most likely temporary. National identities have survived and are persistently asserting themselves. There could be no better evidence that the Communists are not going to rule the world, and neither are we. Aspirations for independence, self-respect and self-government are too universal and too powerful to be subdued by any ideology.

In the meantime, however, American policy increasingly has tended to confuse the containment of Russian (and later Chinese) national power with the containment of Communism. We undertook to apply the methods appropriate to a national power struggle—the methods of diplomatic maneuver, armed confrontation and in some cases war itself—in a realm where they are totally ineffective. Communism as an idea cannot be contained by such methods, but only by a better idea.

It is not the American function to combat revolution everywhere—to stand as the universal, all-embracing guardian of the *status quo*. This is an odd role, by the way, to be thrust upon a nation that was itself born of revolution less than two centuries ago. More important, it is a role that lies beyond the capabilities of any nation. Change is the law of life. Social change will sometimes take revolutionary forms in some countries, no matter what the United States or any other nation thinks about it. A wise foreign policy begins with recognition of this fact.

American foreign policy is in deep trouble in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America precisely because we have let ourselves be pushed into a counter-revolutionary posture. Wherever oppressed masses struggle toward a better life millions of persons look upon the United States as their natural enemy, which means that they inevitably look elsewhere for friends.

Ours is not a revolutionary society, and we should not try to behave as if it were. But we can behave like a mature nation

which knows that it has no right and no power to decide for the people of Cuba, Viet Nam or central Africa what form of revolution they should have. We can behave like a nation which is prepared to accept change, even in forms unpalatable to it, and is ready to work with peoples of any political faith for a peaceful world of diversity.

It is often said that we must hang on in Viet Nam, even to the point of an escalated war, because the effects of defeat there would be so damaging elsewhere in Asia and Africa.

Unfortunately it is true that if we got thrown out of Viet Nam, millions of people would be delighted. That is one reason why our Government would be wise to encourage a political settlement through negotiation before we are thrown out—unless it is already too late. Whatever happens in Saigon, however, the American cause will not be damaged thereby half so much as it is already being damaged by the growing conviction that our power and influence are dedicated to the suppression of social revolution and political change wherever they occur.

We shall improve our position with the developing nations and the world at large not by proving that we can wage endless war in Viet Nam, but by showing, through actual conduct, that the CIA is not enfranchised to swagger around the world setting up governments and knocking them down; that we do not undertake to dictate the form and pace of political change anywhere; that we are prepared to accept revolutions even when we do not approve of them; and that we have enough faith in the ideas of freedom to entrust to them, rather than to arms, the task of containing the ideas of Communism.

JANUARY 17, 1965.

A QUESTION OF AIMS IN VIET NAM

It is now four months since President Johnson announced to the country a great buildup of ground troops in Viet Nam.

Major engagements have been fought, vast tonnages of bombs dropped, thousands of enemy casualties reported, yet, we are told the Viet Cong and North Viet Name are more numerous than ever. Inevitably, pressure is mounting for even more American troops and even more bombs; the military and its clique are straining at the leash to attack Hanoi itself.

Before yet one more fatal step is taken, a review of the national objectives would be in order. In July the President defined the military objective as a limited one: "to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms." How long does it take to establish that postulate? We would say that if it has not been established by now then another stage of escalation will not do it. The Viet Cong's monsoon offensive has been stopped and some limited gains reported from Saigon. A further expansion of the war can be justified only by abandoning the stated objective and adopting another. If that is going to be done, the President has a solemn duty to tell the people why.

In July the President declared our second objective to be a peaceful solution of the conflict; we stood ready, he said, "to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time." But as our military position has strengthened, the outlines of the settlement we would be willing to accept have hardened to the point where there is little visible incentive for the adversary to negotiate. Washington policy makers now insist that a settlement must bar any political status or territorial base for the National Liberation Front, which means simply that the Viet Cong must accept total defeat and melt away.

Under these conditions it is surely no mystery that the Communists show little present disposition to "come to the table."

President Johnson in July spoke vaguely of a settlement carrying out the purposes of the 1954 Geneva agreements, which were

based upon the concept of a militarily neutral Southeast Asia allied to neither the Communists nor the West. But at other times he seems to be pursuing a quite different objective—the unilateral establishment of a puppet state of South Viet Nam under American military protection if not outright occupation.

The nature of the long-term American objective in Viet Nam thus is the key to peace or war. If it is to set up a neutral buffer zone in Southeast Asia—which in our opinion would best serve the national interest, improve our relations with the ex-colonial world, comply with international agreements and offer the best barrier to Chinese national expansion—then a peaceful solution should be possible. If the objective is, instead, to maintain a military base on the mainland of Southeast Asia, to set up a forward position intended to contain China not through the forces of indigenous nationalism but by our own military power, then we are not likely to gain our ends by negotiation.

The attempt to gain them by force, furthermore, means a commitment to years of armed struggle, with the outcome in doubt even if a major war with China or Russia is avoided. It means acceptance of a neo-colonial status that will damage the American cause everywhere in the underdeveloped world. It means continued violation of the United Nations Charter, the continued substitution of our own national will for the rule of law.

President Johnson owes it to the country to ponder very deeply before sliding further into this morass. The assumption that nothing can be done except what has been done is nonsense. Once the basic decision were made that a policy of deepening military commitment does not serve our best interests then a dozen ways of advancing the President's stated desire for a peaceful solution would open up.

To mention only one way, the United Nations could unquestionably play an active role in advancing a peaceful solution if the United States objective were one which other nations could support in compliance with their treaty obligations. The President has called on members of the UN and the Secretary General to help arrange peace, but he has never done what the Charter plainly obligates him to do—permit the whole issue to come before the Security Council. If he is willing to talk peace "with any government any place," why not with the members of the Security Council at UN headquarters?

The Charter says: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force." It says: "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations or shall decide what measures shall be taken . . . to maintain or restore international peace and security." It says "No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council."

When Britain and France undertook armed intervention in the Arab-Israeli conflict, the United States insisted that they give way to the UN. President Eisenhower stated: "The United Nations is alone charged with the responsibility of securing the peace." When India and Pakistan went to war over Kashmir, President Johnson insisted upon intervention by the UN. How can there be one rule for other nations, and a different one for the United States?

The question is our aims in Viet Nam. If our aims were in harmony with the UN Charter and the 1954 Geneva pacts, the UN could act, and its first act undoubtedly would be to call for a cease-fire.

NOVEMBER 26, 1965.

June 9, 1966

Approved For CONGRESSIONAL RECORD RDP67B00446R000400080014-5

12153

have been voting billions for Formosa: Let's find out if this is a satellite we can't use, or who won't play. It is easier to cut Formosa out of the budget than money for the youngsters' hot school lunches or for hospitals. If there is any disaffection on the mainland, one way to find out might be to bring a study group from the Formosa war staff over to Saigon to "study the situation." That's all the blueprint they will need in Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow to show them we mean business about making the most of what we have to fight with.

THE LESSON OF THE MEREDITH CASE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Mississippi shooting of James Meredith showed the need for stronger Federal legislation to protect people exercising their constitutional rights.

I have been advocating such legislation since April 1, 1964 when I introduced a bill to make it a Federal offense to murder a person exercising his civil rights.

Since then a number of similar bills have been introduced. I am a cosponsor of a bill by Senator Douglas which would broaden Federal offenses in the area of civil rights. Under this bill, for instance, the killer of a civil rights worker could be charged in Federal court with the crime of murder, rather than merely with depriving someone of his constitutional rights.

I am also cosponsoring the administration's omnibus civil rights bill, one section of which would make racial violence an explicit Federal crime.

All the rights granted Americans by the U.S. Constitution, and all the Supreme Court decisions carefully defining and protecting these rights, can be nullified by would-be assassins such as the one who gunned down James Meredith. This kind of terror nullifies the rights of every American citizen.

The U.S. Congress cannot allow this to continue.

The fundamental American rights granted by the Constitution must be backed up by Federal law. There have been a great number of tragedies over the years to demonstrate the need for Federal legislation protecting those who merely seek to exercise their American rights. The Meredith case is the latest example. I hope it shocks the American public and the Congress sufficiently to enable us to pass this long overdue legislation.

VISTA VOLUNTEERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should like to share with my colleagues a letter a member of my staff received from two VISTA volunteers serving in the small, remote Eskimo village of Kwigillingok, Alaska.

VISTA volunteers in Alaska are called upon to perform their duties under circumstances few of them could have visualized before their service began. They are performing them well. Indeed, their fame preceded them for before the program was enacted, the native people of Alaska had requested volunteers. Alaska

native people had followed the progress of the Peace Corps closely and when a similar organization was proposed to serve with the country, they were among the first to endorse it.

From time to time I have received letters from volunteers in various Alaska villages. I have been impressed with all of them for each demonstrated a concern for and an understanding of the needs and aspirations of the native people.

Miss Judy Anderson and Miss Chatty Cornelius were assigned to the village of Kwigillingok, located on the barren tundra of the delta formed between the Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers. Their description of what life offers them in the village should be encouraging to all of us for it demonstrates that VISTA has chosen its volunteers wisely and that we were right in enacting the program.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 15, 1966.

DEAR MISS NORDALE: Well, here it is Sunday night in Kwigillingok. We're sitting here in our "living room" writing by candlelight, eating Swedish coffee bread sent from home and drinking coffee. This weekend's been a good one, we've gotten a lot accomplished and it's just now that we've gotten a chance to sit down and write a few letters.

We thank you very much for having replied to our letter as quickly as you did. You can be assured that we are encouraging our people to continue their planning on the proposed move. The people know that Senator BARTLETT will do his best for them and your letter fortified their convictions.

As for life in the village spring has certainly brought Kwig out of its winter's hibernation. We can see every day the men coming back from the ocean with their sleds loaded with seal and walrus. The women then are busy preparing the seal, stretching and drying the skin which is to be sold or sewn and then blown up to be used as containers for seal oil (which are eventually put in the ground to be stored for winter's use).

Aside from our normal work in the village we have our interesting side-lines too: one of our neighbors is going to show us, on Tuesday afternoon, how to use the "ooloo" to skin seal—if, in return, we'll show her how to make the cheese souffle she saw us making the other day!! (You should have seen her face when it came out of the oven—you should have seen ours too—didn't think it would turn out too well as it was our first!)

As for our work day in the village our schedule has been lengthened as the daylight now lasts until 10 p.m., soon to last even longer. Our nursery school, 9-11, five mornings a week is doing fine, now including three-year-olds as well as the four and five-year-olds. Eskimo children are certainly much different from children in the "Lower 48"—there are devils and angels everywhere!

In the afternoon our house is flooded with little kids, some days there being game hours and others being reading time or story hour.

Our Brownies and Jr. Scouts are doing fine and are now all excited about their past rummage sale (held last Saturday). We gave them a few hints about pricing but they did the majority of the work—and were very proud to report that they had earned \$104.76! (We feel like proud mother hens!) (And we were very pleased to find a native girl who has now taken over leadership of the Jr. Scouts.) The girls are now getting excited about the forthcoming July Fourth

celebration. Kwig's first parade and Memorial Service to the men in Vietnam.

So, this summer certainly holds a lot in store for us including egg hunting, berry picking and our town council president is even loaning us his kayak so we can practice paddling on the lake!

Don't know whether we told you or not but we had a red fox as a pet til it got away—but now have another pet—this time caught by a villager at the ocean: a pet baby seal! Thought we'd be able to cuddle it but it snaps like a dog and won't let us within five feet of it! So, we now have a "guest" on our porch!

Well, Miss Nordale, we're running out of space and the candles are flickering so as we have a busy day tomorrow (nursery school, Brownies tutoring) we had better sign off now. Our regards to Senator BARTLETT.

Love,

JUDY and CHATTYE.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TO PERMIT THE PLANTING OF ALTERNATE CROPS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 15151.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the conference report for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amending of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15151) to permit the planting of alternate crops and acreage which is un-planted because of a natural disaster.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN FORMS OF COPPER

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1186, House bill 12676. I understand that this bill has been cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12676) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1220), explaining the purposes of the bill.

June 9, 1966

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 12676 suspends temporarily, for the period February 9, 1966, to June 30, 1968, the duties applicable to unwrought copper (except nickel silver), copper waste, and scrap, and copper articles imported to be used in remanufacture by melting. The bill would also suspend for the same period the duties applicable to the copper content of certain copper-bearing ores and materials. The duties that would be suspended by the bill would in each case amount to 1.7 cents per pound of pure copper which may be commercially obtained from the imported article, except that in the case of nickel silver waste and scrap the rate is 1.7 cents per pound of the commercially recoverable copper content plus 10 percent ad valorem.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Copper is a metal that is of vital importance to the Nation's defense and nondefense needs. It is used in the electrical industry in the manufacture of generators, motors, locomotives, telephone and telegraph equipment, light and power transmission lines, and numerous other items. It is consumed by the copper-base alloy industry in the manufacture of products used in building construction, principally plumbing and roofing materials, and in the manufacture of automobiles and trucks, in shipbuilding, in the production of ammunition, and for a wide variety of other purposes.

In 1965 the United States consumed about 2 million tons of refined copper, about 90 percent of which was domestically produced. The balance of approximately 200,000 tons was imported. Chile supplied about 100,000 tons of such imports, while approximately 40,000 tons came from Canada and 60,000 tons from Peru. Despite substantial increments in recent years in the domestic production of copper, such output has not been sufficient to satisfy increased domestic consumption requirements.

In midautumn of last year, it became increasingly apparent that world demand for copper exceeded world supply. The short supply has been reflected in pressure on copper prices both at home and abroad. The U.S. producers' price for refined copper, which until March 1964 had remained constant at 81 cents a pound for about 3 years, experienced three increases in the space of little more than 1 year, going from 31 to 32 in 34 cents and then to 36 cents per pound in May 1965. After consultations and conferences with representatives of the Federal Government, domestic producers have endeavored, on a voluntary basis, to maintain the 36-cent-per-pound producers price for domestic copper in the U.S. market. These producers have continued to maintain this price level to the present time.

The prices for copper outside the United States, however, have ranged in recent months from a minimum of 42 cents per pound to a maximum of about 90 cents per pound. The spot price of copper on the London Metal Exchange on May 3 was about 70 cents per pound. On April 14, 1966, Chile (which sets the price for its copper may be sold) announced that the price for its copper would be increased, effective July 1, 1966, to 62 cents per pound from 42 cents.

The administration has taken several steps to prevent similar sharp increases in the price of copper in this country and to safeguard U.S. supplies of copper for U.S. consumers. It (1) released about 200,000 short tons from the national stockpile in November 1965; (2) tightened export controls through its export licensing authority on November 24, 1965, December 14, 1965, and January 20, 1966; (3) requested the Commodity Exchange to increase margin requirements

on copper futures from 10 percent to about 70 percent in an effort to curb speculation; (4) authorized an additional 200,000 tons of copper to be released from the national stockpile during 1966; (5) is attempting to expand domestic output through subsidy payments; and (6) has entered into agreements with the governments of copper-producing nations to hold a United Nations conference in an effort to stabilize production and prices. These actions are part of a four-step program announced November 17, 1965, to maximize the supply of copper in the United States to provide for stabilization of the domestic market, and to maintain a noninflationary price level for copper. The copper program, as well as an arrangement with Chile to insure that the quantity of copper it previously exported to this country will continue to be available to U.S. consumers at the lower U.S. price, is described in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means by the Under Secretary of State. This letter appears in the appendix of this report.

H.R. 12676 would lower the cost of imported copper to U.S. consumers by the amount of the U.S. import duty and to that extent would help prevent a rise in the U.S. price of copper during the present shortage. However, so long as the world price for copper is far higher than the U.S. price (as it is today), eliminating the 1.7-cent duty will attract little foreign copper to the U.S. market. On the other hand if the price differential narrows the duty suspension provided by this bill could make a significant contribution to our efforts to assure adequate copper supplies at reasonable prices.

As stated above, H.R. 12676 provides for a temporary suspension of duty on copper raw materials and copper scrap, for the period February 9, 1966, to June 30, 1968, both dates inclusive. Your committee notes that similar legislation has been favorably reported by your committee and enacted by the Congress for periods in the past when the available supply of copper was insufficient to meet demand and pressure on prices existed. The periods covered by such prior enactments are as follows: April 30, 1947, to the close of March 31, 1949 (Public Law 80-42, approved April 29, 1947); April 1, 1949, to the close of June 30, 1950 (Public Law 81-33, approved March 31, 1949); April 1, 1951, to the close of June 30, 1958 (Public Law 82-38, approved May 22, 1951, as extended by Public Law 83-4, approved February 14, 1953; Public Law 83-452, approved June 30, 1954; and Public Law 84-91, approved June 21, 1955).

The suspensions of duty provided under H.R. 12676, as reported by your committee, would be inapplicable during any period in which the price of electrolytic copper in standard shapes and sizes, delivered Connecticut Valley, is below 24 cents per pound as determined pursuant to headnote 5, subpart 2C, schedule 6, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. It would also be inapplicable to copper from Communist countries.

Your committee has received favorable reports on H.R. 12676 from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. Your committee recommends expeditious enactment of this legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PERMIT THE PLANTING OF ALTERNATE CROPS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amending of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15151) to permit the planting of alternate crops on acreage which is unplanted because of a natural disaster.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, frequently during the extended consideration given on the floor of the Senate to H.R. 15151, a bill primarily designed to give emergency assistance to cotton producers who have been suffering from natural disaster this spring, there has been complaint that this bill has not received adequate consideration. Actually, it has received a great deal of consideration since its introduction and that of other similar measures both in the House and the Senate some 3 weeks ago.

Because of the almost unprecedented heavy rainfall in the cotton counties of Missouri and other cotton producing areas of the Mississippi Valley—Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas—on May 19 I joined with a number of other Senators in co-sponsoring S. 3382 to permit planting of soybeans in lieu of cotton on cotton acreage not planted because of this natural disaster, without loss of cotton equalization payments or diversion payments for participating farmers.

On the preceding day, May 18, several similar bills, including H.R. 15151, had been introduced in the House by Members of that body from these affected areas.

There was some discussion yesterday that this bill had not gone to the House committee. That was not correct. Actually the bill was considered in two separate meetings.

On Friday morning, May 20, members of the House Agriculture Committee met for a hearing on this bill and on Tuesday morning, May 24, that committee met again, acted on the bill introduced by the Honorable PAUL C. Jones of Missouri. At this meeting on May 24, the committee agreed unanimously to amend the bill so that it would "permit the planting of alternate crops on acreage which is unplanted because of a natural disaster" not only for cotton but also for feed grains and wheat.

The House, recognizing the emergency, accepted the amendment and passed the bill that same day, Tuesday, May 24, and sent it to the Senate.

Also recognizing the emergency, the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee on Thursday, May 26, requested that the bill remain at the desk so that it could be taken up immediately. He had consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader and those interested in the bill and there was no objection whatever to taking it up.

Subsequently, however, despite requests from a number of Senators interested in immediate consideration, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] did voice objection and asked that

June 9, 1966

Steed	Tuck	White, Idaho
Stephens	Tunney	White, Tex.
Stratton	Tuton	Whitener
Stubblefield	Udall	Whitten
Sullivan	Ullman	Widnall
Taylor	Vanik	Wilson, Bob
Teague, Calif.	Vigorito	Wolff
Teague, Tex.	Vivian	Wright
Tenzer	Walker, N. Mex.	Wydler
Thomas	Watkins	Yates
Thompson, Tex.	Watts	Young
Thompson, Wis.	Weintraub	Younger
Todd	Whalley	Zablocki

NAYS—20

Buchanan	Edwards, Ala.	Quillen
Callaway	Haley	Reuss
Cameron	Ichord	Rhodes, Ariz.
Carter	Martin, Ala.	Van Deerlin
Corman	O'Neal, Ga.	Walker, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Passman	Watson
Dickinson	Pool	

NOT VOTING—79

Abbitt	Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashmore	Hardy	Pelly
Baring	Harvey, Mich.	Powell
Bell	Hebert	Race
Blatnik	Herlong	Rees
Bolling	Holifield	Rivers, Alaska
Bolton	Hosmer	Rivers, S.C.
Brown, Calif.	Keogh	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Scott
Don H.	Landrum	Sonner
Clawson, Del	Lennon	Sikes
Colmer	Long, La.	Smith, N.Y.
Curtis	McMillan	Sweeney
Dawson	Macdonald	Talcott
de la Garza	Matsunaga	Miller
Dent	Mills	Thompson, N.J.
Denton	Minish	Toll
Dyal	Mize	Trimble
Edwards, La.	Morris	Tupper
Ellsworth	Morrison	Utt
Evins, Tenn.	Mosher	Waggonner
Fino	Moss	Williams
Flood	Multer	Willis
Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Charles H.
Fulton, Tenn.	Murray	Wyatt
Gilligan	Nix	
Gubser		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Minish with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Del Clawson.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Race with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
 Mr. Morris with Mrs. Bolton.
 Mr. Hebert with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Tupper.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Mills.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Senner with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Landrum.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Waggonner.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Williams.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Flynt.
 Mr. Dyal with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Abbott.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Curtis.
 Mr. Flood with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Smith of New York.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. CARTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12876. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15151) entitled "An act to permit the planting of alternate crops on acreage which is unplanted because of a natural disaster."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

FATHER'S DAY

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 873.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 873

Resolved, That the third Sunday in June of each year is hereby designated at "Father's Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the appropriate Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, inviting the governors of the States and com-

munities and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, and urging our people to offer public and private expressions on such day to the abiding love and gratitude which they bear for their fathers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RESNICK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RESNICK

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 1, strike out "each year" and insert "1966".

Page 1, line 3, strike the word "annually".

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

VIETNAM AND PRESS COVERAGE

(Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an editorial.)

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared recently in the St. Joseph, Mo., News-Press:

VIETNAM AFFAIR AND PRESS COVERAGE

Every administration in Washington sooner or later shoots at the press for its own shortcomings. It was true of Theodore Roosevelt who invented an Ananias Club to which he consigned reporters who printed the truth, news not colored as T.R. wanted it. It was true of Herbert Hoover who shied away from all publicity after his gorgeous honeymoon wrecked confidence in his administration over the world depression. It was most surely true of Franklin D. Roosevelt, perhaps most of all. (Remember his satirical gesture awarding an Iron Cross to a White House correspondent who dared print the truth?).

And so it is with the Lyndon B. Johnson administration. The President himself stays in the background but very recently a White House secretary spoke of "inexperienced reporters" and "headline type of coverage" as to Viet Nam. Another aide spoke of "distorted reports from Viet Nam."

Fortunately, we the press of America, have a top newspaper man who knows news. He happens to be Wes Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press. He is a man who has come up through the ranks, having been with that famed, and leading news-gathering organization since 1937. Wes is sick and tired of the sniping from the Palace Guard of the President. He defies AP and all news gathering detractors in words that are worthy to be read by the general public.

"The fact is" says Wes Gallagher, "the press always has been attacked in wartime because its reports frequently clash with government views and with the image government would like to present. And reporters too must bring unpleasant, confusing and discouraging reports to the public which reacts, as all people do, with irritation."

Mr. Gallagher correctly states that criticism of the press by the government rises in direct proportion to the amount of adverse news printed which may not be in line with government policy.

June 9, 1966

Fuqua	Mallillard	Schneebeli
Goodell	Marsh	Schweiker
Gross	Martin, Ala.	Secret
Grover	Martin, Mass.	Selden
Gurney	Martin, Nebr.	Shriver
Haley	May	Sikes
Hall	Michel	Skubitz
Halleck	Minshall	Smith, Calif.
Halpern	Moore	Smith, N.Y.
Hansen, Idaho	Morton	Smith, Va.
Harsha	Natcher	Springer
Harvey, Ind.	Nelsen	Stafford
Horton	O'Konski	Stanton
Hutchinson	O'Neal, Ga.	Steed
Ichor	Passman	Stephens
Jarman	Pirnie	Taylor
Johnson, Pa.	Poff	Teague, Calif.
Jonas	Pool	Teague, Tex.
Keith	Pucinski	Thomson, Wis.
King, N.Y.	Quile	Tuck
Kornegay	Quillen	Vigorito
Kunkel	Redlin	Walker, Miss.
Kupferman	Reid, III	Walker, N. Mex.
Laird	Reifel	Watkins
Langen	Reinecke	Watson
Latta	Rhodes, Ariz.	Whalley
Lipscomb	Robison	Whitener
McClosky	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
McCullough	Rogers, Tex.	Widnall
McDade	Roudebush	Wilson, Bob
McEwen	Rumsfeld	Wyder
MacGregor	Satterfield	Younger
Mahon	Saylor	

NAYS—200

Adams	Gonzalez	O'Brien
Addabbo	Grabowski	O'Hara, Mich.
Albert	Gray	Olsen, Mont.
Anderson,	Green, Oreg.	Olson, Minn.
Tenn.	Green, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass.
Annunzio	Greigg	Ottinger
Ashley	Grider	Patman
Aspinwall	Griffiths	Patten
Bandstra	Hagen, Calif.	Pepper
Barrett	Hamilton	Perkins
Beckworth	Hanley	Philbin
Bingham	Hanna	Pickle
Boggs	Hansen, Iowa	Pike
Boland	Hansen, Wash.	Poage
Brademas	Hathaway	Price
Brooks	Hawkins	Randall
Burke	Hays	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Hechler	Resnick
Byrne, Pa.	Helstoski	Reuss
Cabell	Henderson	Rhodes, Pa.
Callan	Hicks	Roberts
Cameron	Holland	Rodino
Carey	Howard	Rogers, Colo.
Casey	Hull	Ronan
Celler	Hungate	Roncalio
Chafee	Huot	Roosevelt
Clark	Irwin	Rosenthal
Clevenger	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Jennings	Roush
Conte	Joelson	Royal
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Ryan
Corbett	Johnson, Okla.	St Germain
Corman	Jones, Ala.	St Onge
Craley	Jones, Mo.	Scheuer
Culver	Jones, N.C.	Schisler
Daddario	Karsten	Schmidhauser
Daniels	Karth	Shipley
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Sickles
Diggs	Kee	Sisk
Dingell	Kelly	Slack
Donohue	King, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
Dow	King, Utah	Stagers
Dulski	Kirwan	Stalbaum
Duncan, Oreg.	Kluczynski	Stratton
Edmondson	Krebs	Stubblefield
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Sullivan
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Tenzer
Everett	Love	Thomas
Fallon	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Farbstein	McDowell	Todd
Farnsley	McFall	Tunney
Farnum	McGrath	Tuttmann
Fascell	McVicker	Udall
Feighan	Machen	Ullman
Fogarty	Mackay	Van Deerlin
Foley	Mackie	Vanik
Ford,	Madden	Vivian
William D.	Mathias	Watts
Fraser	Matthews	Weltner
Frelinghuysen	Meeds	White, Idaho
Friedel	Mink	White, Tex.
Gallagher	Moeller	Wolff
Garmatz	Monagan	Wright
Gathings	Moorhead	Yates
Gettys	Morgan	Young
Giamo	Morse	Zablocki
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	
Gilbert	Nedzi	

NOT VOTING—75

Abbitt	Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashmore	Hardy	Pelly
Baring	Harvey, Mich.	Powell
Biatnik	Hebert	Purcell
Bolling	Herlong	Race
Bolton	Hollifield	Rees
Brown, Calif.	Hosmer	Rivers, Alaska
Clausen,	Keogh	Rivers, S.C.
Don H.	Landrum	Rooney, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Lennon	Scott
Colmer	Long, La.	Sennet
Conyers	McMillan	Sweeney
Dawson	Macdonald	Talcott
de la Garza	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Dent	Miller	Toll
Denton	Mills	Trimble
Dyal	Minish	Tupper
Edwards, La.	Mize	Utt
Ellsworth	Morris	Waggoner
Evins, Tenn.	Morrison	Williams
Fino	Moser	Willis
Flood	Moss	Wilson, Charles H.
Flynt	Multer	Wyatt
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.	
Gilligan	Murray	
Gubser	Nix	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Keogh with Mr. Talcott.
- Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Pelly.
- Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Hosmer.
- Mr. Dent with Mr. Fino.
- Mr. Lennon with Mr. Ellsworth.
- Mr. Minish with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
- Mr. Miller with Mr. Utt.
- Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Don H.
- Mr. Multer with Mr. Del Clawson.
- Mr. Evans of Tennessee with Mr. Gubser.
- Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Wyatt.
- Mr. Gilligan with Mr. Mize.
- Mr. Race with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
- Mr. Morris with Mrs. Bolton.
- Mr. Hebert with Mr. Mosher.
- Mr. Morrison with Mr. Tupper.
- Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Mills.
- Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McMillan.
- Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Scott.
- Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Colmer.
- Mr. Sennet with Mr. Herlong.
- Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Landrum.
- Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Dawson.
- Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Nix.
- Mr. Denton with Mr. Willis.
- Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Waggoner.
- Mr. Trimble with Mr. Williams.
- Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
- Mr. Toll with Mr. Flynt.
- Mr. Dyal with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.
- Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Baring.
- Mr. Hardy with Mr. de la Garza.
- Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Purcell.
- Mr. Moss with Mr. Powell.
- Mr. Rees with Mr. Conyers.
- Mr. Flood with Mr. Murray.

Mr. JOHNSON of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ROGERS of Texas, HALPERN, and MACGREGOR changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 20, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—333

Abernethy	Farnum	McFall
Adair	Fascell	McGrath
Adams	Feighan	McVicker
Addabbo	Findley	MacGregor
Albert	Fisher	Machen
Anderson, Ill.	Fogarty	Mackay
Tenn.	Ford Gerald R. Ford	Mackie
Andrews,	William D. Fountaine	Madden
George W.	Fraser	Friedel
Andrews,	Frelinghuysen	Mailliard
N. Dak.	Fulton, Pa.	Marsh
Annunzio	Fuqua	Mathias
Arends	Gallagher	Meeds
Bates	Garmatz	Michel
Bandstra	Gathings	Mink
Bates	Aspinall	Minshall
Barrett	Ayres	Moeller
Battin	Gialmo	Monagan
Beckworth	Gibbons	Moore
Belcher	Gonzalez	Moorhead
Bennett	Goodell	Morgan
Berry	Grabowski	Morse
Betts	Grainger	Morton
Bingham	Haggen, Calif.	Murphy, Ill.
Boggs	Hall	Natcher
Boland	Hagen, Calif.	Nedzi
Brown, Clar-	Haleck	Nelsen
ence J., Jr.	Hamilton	O'Brien
Bryhill, N.C.	Hanley	O'Hara, Mich.
Bryhill, Va.	Hanna	O'Konski
Burke	Hansen, Idaho	Olsen, Mont.
Burleson	Hansen, Iowa	Olson, Minn.
Burton, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.	O'Neill, Mass.
Burton, Utah	Harsha	Ottinger
Byrne, Pa.	Harvey, Ind.	Patman
Byrnes, Wis.	Hathaway	Patten
Cabell	Hawkins	Pepper
Cahill	Hays	Perkins
Callan	Hechler	Pickles
Carey	Heistoski	Pike
Casey	Henderson	Piranie
Cederberg	Hicks	Poage
Celler	Holland	Poff
Chamberlain	Horton	Price
Chelf	Howard	Reifel
Clancy	Hull	Reinecke
Clark	Hungate	Resnick
Cleveland	Hutton	Rhodes, Pa.
Clevenger	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cohelan	Irwin	Robison
Collier	Jacobs	Rodino
Conable	Jarman	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Jennings	Rogers, Fla.
Conyers	Joelson	Rogers, Tex.
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Ronan
Corbett	Johnson, Okla.	Roncalio
Craley	Johnson, Pa.	Rooney, Pa.
Cramer	Jones	Rosenthal
Culver	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Cunningham	Jones, Mo.	Roudebush
Curtin	Jones, N.C.	Roush
Daddario	Karsten	Royal
Dague	Karth	Rumsfeld
Daniels	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Delaney	Kee	Satterfield
Derwinski	Keith	St Germain
Devine	King, Calif.	St Onge
Diggs	King, N.Y.	Scheuer
Dingell	King, Utah	Schisler
Dole	Kirwan	Schneebeli
Donohue	Krebs	Schweiker
Dorn	Krebs	Secrest
Dow	Kunkel	Sipley
Dowdy	Kupferman	Shriver
Downing	Laird	Sickles
Dulski	Langen	Sletta
Duncan, Oreg.	Letta	Staggers
Duncan, Tenn.	Leggett	Stalbaum
Dwyer	Lipscomb	Stanton
Edmondson	Long, Md.	
Edwards, Calif.	Love	
Erlenborn	McCarthy	
Evans, Colo.	McClory	
Everett	McCulloch	
Fallon	McDade	
Farbstein	McDowell	
Farnsley	McFadell	
Foster	McNally	
Fraser	McNulty	
Frelinghuysen	McPhee	
Friedel	McSweeney	
Gallagher	McTigue	
Garmatz	McWhorter	
Gathings	McWhorter	
Gettys	McWhorter	
Giamo	McWhorter	
Gibbons	McWhorter	
Gilbert	McWhorter	

June 9, 1966

The inexperience charge is totally untrue. Men covering the Viet Nam war are far more experienced in fair, impartial reporting than are government yes men who hop, skip and jump at the brow-lifting or finger-twirling of that man from Texas who succeeded John F. Kennedy, as our President.

The present Associated Press staff in Viet Nam ranges in age from 61 to 25 with experience in reporting as follows: 35 years, 28 years, 23 years, 18 years, 14 years, 13 years, 11 years, 8 years and 7 years. Three have covered World War II and the Korean "police action."

The News-Press and Gazette are proud of the wholesome coverage the Associated Press is giving our readers as to Viet Nam. Last year your Associated Press spent three-quarters of a million dollars on staff and communications.

Let this be said and we defy successful contradiction from anyone in Washington:

Newspaper reporting from Viet Nam has been more accurate than the official statements, whether via the Pentagon, the field, the State Department, or the White House inner circle.

The Associated Press is covering a war, not a political hullabaloo, even if some in Washington think otherwise. This war, and do not fool yourself, this is war in Viet Nam, has presented the most confusing and controversial in all American history. There are the world of impoundables, the huge gaps between the South and the North Vietnamese, between the hawks and the doves, by those for and those against the war.

American correspondents in Viet Nam as a whole, report all correctly, to the dismay at times alternately of the hawks and of the doves, and always of the pressure men called White House press aides.

How lovely it would be to Washington if the press reported only the good news from Viet Nam. But that is not good newspapering. That is deceit, unworthy of the Fourth Estate.

The function of the press is to present the news, good or bad, fairly and without slightest bias. Let critics cry. The people want truth.

A PERMANENT U.N. PEACEKEEPING FORCE

(Mr. SCHWEIKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, 49 of my colleagues and I are today introducing a resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force.

Particularly at this time of international tension, it would seem to me that the United States, as one of the leading member nations of the U.N., ought to continue its attempts to help strengthen that important world body.

Earlier this year, efforts were made to bring the Vietnam conflict before the Security Council for discussion. In my view, these efforts were both necessary and desirable and should continue at the earliest possible date. For it is through such efforts that the United Nations will continue to perform its important role in world affairs.

By the same token, such actions as we are calling for in this resolution today can add immeasurably to the United Nations' effectiveness in dealing with crises in any sector of the globe.

Almost 8 years ago, during the summer of 1958, the Congress passed a resolution

expressing the sense of Congress that the United Nations General Assembly should immediately consider making permanent arrangements for a U.N. observation and patrol force for use in situations threatening international peace and security.

It was envisioned that this force would be along the same lines as the one in use in the Middle East that year, and that no member of the Security Council would contribute manpower to the force.

Other similar proposals have been made subsequently, but with the heightening of international fears over the war in Vietnam, I think that the Congress, speaking for the Nation, ought at this time and in this manner to emphasize our interest in peace and in strengthening the organizations which might help to achieve peace.

I believe that we should let the world know that our objective is to improve and strengthen the United Nations so that it can share the burdens of leadership in crises of this type.

It is important also to point out to the world that the American eagle holds an olive branch as well as a sheaf of arrows and that we want to do everything possible to strengthen the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. And while this may be a distant goal, we should make clear to all nations of the world as well as our own citizens our intention to pursue this objective.

One proposal to accomplish this is the creation of a permanent U.N. peacekeeping force. It is particularly appropriate at this time for the Congress to consider anew the value of such an expression of its views in this important area.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 690

Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force

Whereas Congress has urged that the United Nations should develop permanent organization and procedures to "enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security" (H. Con Res. 373, 85th Congress, 2d Session); and

Whereas the need for such a force appears likely to continue; and

Whereas a United Nations force, established on a permanent basis, could be an important instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress reaffirms its support for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force and urges the United States delegation to the United Nations to present a plan to the Twenty-first General Assembly for the establishment of such a United Nations "World Peace Force" on a permanent basis and for rules to govern the proper and effective use of such a peacekeeping force and provisions to train, equip, and finance it.

In view of our involvement in Viet Nam, it is more important than ever that we continue our search for peace. That is why, in the past, I have supported legislation providing funds for the United Nations—such as the U.N. bond issue—and the establishment of and funding for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. Speaker, joining with Mr. MOORHEAD and me today are the following of our colleagues: Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOW, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mrs. GREEN of OREGON, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARVEY of Michigan, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KUPFERMAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MULTER, Mr. OLSEN of Montana, Mr. OLSON of Minnesota, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RACE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. VIVIAN, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WOLFE.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to point out that the resolutions introduced by Messrs. ELLSWORTH, HORTON, MATHIAS, MORSE, and REID of New York call, in addition to the plan for the peacekeeping force itself, for "an unqualified offer of 1,000 technical and noncombatant personnel from the American Military Establishment to serve as a permanent unit subject to call by the United Nations in the event of an international emergency."

I was pleased this week to learn that former President Eisenhower, while attending a tribute to the United Nations in Kansas City, called for the establishment of a U.N. peacekeeping force that could "move in with power" to prevent war.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my hope that the Congress, in these difficult days of international tension, will again and soon express their concern over this matter, and I call upon other Members of this body to join us in this effort and to give their thoughtful consideration to other methods by which the United Nations may be further strengthened.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have filed a similar resolution and wish to compliment the gentleman for his forward-looking message here today.

It has long been clear to me that our cold war confrontations around the world can only be solved successfully and satisfactorily through multilateral action. The intervention of a single country against the aggressions and invasions of the Communist world are not sufficient to bring an end to such aggressions, short of all-out war.

The United Nations must be supported in all its goals and capacities. And, as a forum for collective action by all the nations of the world, it can and will reduce the commitment and obligations of any one nation. Perhaps our problems in Vietnam would be considerably less critical if the United Nations could have taken a stronger hand.

June 9, 1966

A PERMANENT U.N. PEACEKEEPING FORCE

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with Mr. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas; Mr. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, of Maryland; Mr. E. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts; and Mr. OGDEN R. REID of New York led by Mr. SCHWEIKER and Mr. MOORHEAD, in submitting a concurrent resolution to set up a permanent peacekeeping apparatus within the United Nations. In the resolution which I submitted, I have incorporated an amendment which, in addition to seeking the submission of a plan for a peacekeeping force by our U.N. delegation, offers a concrete proposal for American participation in the U.N. peacekeeping establishment.

The amendment to this resolution, which my colleagues, ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, F. BRADFORD MORSE, and OGDEN R. REID are co-sponsoring with me, provides for the unconditional offering by the United States of 1,000 technical and noncombatant military personnel to serve as a permanent unit subject to call by the United Nations in the event of an international emergency.

By taking the lead in offering a concrete contribution of manpower to a permanent peacekeeping U.N. force, we will be surrounding the plan we propose in the General Assembly with an atmosphere of sincerity and urgency it would not possess without an offer of men and action.

As a peace-loving people, we are frequently puzzled when citizens of other lands question our motives and actions in the international arena. The goal of the American people is peace, and at a time when world tensions are high and when our motives are doubted, we must give even higher priority to our peaceful ambitions, and their fruition throughout the world. The priority that must be given to this goal has been recognized by the more than 40 Congressmen who have submitted this resolution today.

We can demonstrate the urgency of our desire for an effective peace by offering a permanent and workable plan for a U.N. peacekeeping force when that body convenes in the fall.

Those of us who have joined in this amendment believe that any question or doubt that is raised about our motives in proposing such a plan will be fully and resolutely answered if the United States accompanies its proposal with an unconditional offer of personnel to help implement the permanency of the peacekeeping apparatus.

A year ago, the proposal to offer 1,000 American personnel for U.N. call was conceived by those of us who support it today. At that time, we called the plan the First Brigade—Forces for International Relief on Standby.

Let the First Brigade stand as the first step toward establishing a permanent facility for policing and containing the crises which have prevented the hot wars of this century from cooling to the point of true peace.

[Mr. CONTE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A PERMANENT PEACEKEEPING FORCE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today, along with more than 40 of our colleagues, calling for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force.

The resolution urges the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to present such a plan at the next session of the General Assembly and to propose rules for the proper and effective use of such a peacekeeping force.

There can be little question that in its 21 years the United Nations has played an important role as a peacemaker and a peacekeeper. Its presence has limited conflicts in the Congo and the Middle East, in Kashmir, and on Cyprus. Its presence has undoubtedly prevented conflicts between other nations in many areas of the world.

But the U.N.'s peacekeeping force has been much like a volunteer fire department. Its effectiveness has depended largely on the availability and willingness of its members to participate. For an organization charged with the momentous responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, a more permanent and dependable arrangement is urgently needed.

The fact of the matter is that the General Assembly has been unwilling to use its powers to require every member to share in financing the costs of past peacekeeping operations.

We are further frustrated by the ability of even a single member to prevent the United Nations from acting in its capacity to keep or to restore peace.

This situation must not be allowed to continue. If peace is an overriding necessity of mankind—which I fervently believe it is—then a more reasonable and realistic approach to peacekeeping is required.

A standby U.N. force would go a long way toward meeting this objective. It would be a far more effective means of insuring an international presence where and when it is required.

It should have appeal to large and small nations alike, for brushfires can spread, and peace in an interdependent world is indivisible.

It is practicable, furthermore, as is made clear by the expressed willingness of 10 nations to date to earmark forces for the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the financial structures of the United Nations also requires urgent attention. It is not healthy for a world organization to depend repeatedly on one, or even a few of its members, for financial relief. I would hope that action to make the U.N. financially self-sufficient would be acted on in concert with efforts to strengthen its peacekeeping capacity. Both are essential if the United Nations is more effectively to discharge its responsibilities and to fulfill the hopes held by so much of mankind.

LANHAM "TEX" CONNOR, FORMER DEAN OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

(Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in behalf of Lanham Connor, whom we affectionately call "Tex." As many of you know, Tex retired recently after many years of faithful service as an Official Reporter to House Committees. In fact, for the past 8 years he has been dean of Official Reporters to House Committees.

Tex hails from the State of Texas. He is the nephew of the late Fritz Lanham, who served in the U.S. House of Representatives for many years. His grandfather, S. W. T. Lanham, served two terms as Governor of the State of Texas and then was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives where he served 25 years with distinction.

Tex came to Washington in 1939 as a free lance reporter, and did not begin working for the House of Representatives until 1942, when the late Speaker Sam Rayburn appointed him to the corps of Official Reporters to House Committees. I understand he has "reported" every Defense Subcommittee appropriations bill for the past 24 years. That is quite a record. As a member of that subcommittee I am well aware of the fine job he has done.

During the hearings before the Legislative Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Subcommittee tributes were paid to Tex. I had left the committee room to answer a rollcall and was not present, but I am pleased to include the remarks made by my colleagues:

TRIBUTES TO TEX CONNOR

Mr. SLACK. The record will show at this point that Tex Connor, who I understand was the dean of official committee reporters, has just recently retired. He has been a very loyal and faithful reporter to the committees, and particularly to the Committee on Appropriations, and we certainly wish Tex and his wife many happy years to come.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my word of commendation to our old friend, Tex Connor, and to join in wishing him a very profitable and enjoyable retirement. I know that he has well earned this retirement and we hope he has many years to enjoy it.

We will miss him. He is quite an individual. We all came to appreciate him more than as just one of the helpers around here. He became a very good personal friend and we certainly will miss him.

We hope that in his pursuit of his favorite hobby of fishing that he will find some time to come back and renew old acquaintances when it suits him.

I certainly believe he is one man whose devotion to duty and efficiency and all around good personality endeared him to every member of the Appropriations Committee, or any other committees that had occasion to work with him.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to add my good wishes to those already extended by the chairman and my colleagues on behalf of Tex Connor. We certainly hope that the future holds for him a wealth of comfort and satisfaction. I am sure that the Congress will benefit for a good many years from the criteria that he has established

June 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12317

the public. I would say this is less of an invasion than a "border skirmish."

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues will note, I have been incensed by these charges. I am no enemy of conservation, and my 36 colleagues joining me in this bill are no enemies of conservation. I, for one, fought long and hard for the Wilderness Act. I devoted great time and effort to the Land and Water Conservation Act. I am working right now for passage of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore bill. And I shall continue to work for conservation and park legislation as long as I am in the Congress. To have legislation I have sponsored attacked in this irresponsible manner is highly offensive to me, and I have wanted my colleagues to have the benefit of a prompt reply from me to these attacks on my bill.

What is proposed in the Colorado River Basin project bill is a solution to part of the immediate water needs of Arizona and California and the financing of future water imports or other works to meet the needs of five other Western States.

I hope my colleagues will note that nowhere does the Sierra Club say that the water will be auxiliary or unneeded. It is needed desperately. Our populations are growing in the West, and people need water. It is not going to solve the problem merely to tell people to stay home in Wisconsin or Pennsylvania. They are going to come because this Nation is growing, and our population is moving. We cannot tell the West to "stop growing"; it is going to grow whether the Sierra Club likes it or not.

Instead of attacking this legislation as ruining the Grand Canyon the Sierra Club ought to praise the people who have drafted it because it gives such great respect to Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument. Far from ruining the canyon these dams will insure that no serious and damaging incursions will occur in the future. The job will be done, and it will be done right.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, this legislation marks a great beginning on the long fight to solve this Nation's mounting water crisis. In years past we have always dealt with our water problems on a local, piecemeal basis. For this reason Arizona and California were at odds for years, and we went to the Supreme Court to settle our dispute. Now we are on the same side, working together. I do not think you could find greater evidence of the statesmanship involved in this legislation, or of the significance of what we are attempting to do. What we propose is a regional solution of major water problems. What we succeed in doing here can set the pattern for other regions of the country to follow, and through these acts of water statesmanship we can come to grips at last with the myriad of water problems facing so many of our States.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to answer each of the charges made by the Sierra Club in these ads. I hope and trust my colleagues will rest easier knowing that these sweeping charges are either false, misleading, or both. And I

can assure my colleagues that neither I nor the 36 cosponsors of my bill would endorse legislation meeting the descriptions applied to it by the Sierra Club today.

Before concluding I should like to refer to a recent statement by Laurence Rockefeller, Chairman of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, who said:

Conservationists have had to do some re-thinking, too. For most conservationists, development had long been an anathema: they have been interested in nondevelopment, and to them the natural foe has been the bulldozer and the builder—indeed, some conservationists would go almost so far as to include people.

Unswerving hostility to development, however, condemns the conservationists to a rear guard action, and more and more of them are coming to recognize that this is defeatist. If conservation, as I believe, involves the wise use of our renewable resources, those who wish to see better environment for our people must work with the future. Whether one likes it or not, many more houses are going to be built, many more bridges and highways, and the important question is not if, but how.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Rockefeller is right and the Sierra Club is wrong in this instance. I would hope the Sierra Club would reconsider before proceeding further with this ill-conceived attack on a sound and constructive solution to the water problems of the Southwest. I certainly do not believe it has anything constructive to offer when it concludes one of these ads with this statement:

In five years your Reclamation engineers can close the Grand Canyon show—the essence and excellence of it—end it for all our civilization's time.

I trust all who have stuck with me through this rather lengthy speech will understand now how false—how utterly and completely false—is that statement. The Grand Canyon show is not coming to an end. It is going to go on for the rest of time. And a lot more people are going to see it than ever before.

(Mr. UDALL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. UDALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GONZALEZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

U.S. CAMERAMEN AND REPORTERS WORK UNDER EXTREMELY HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1966, I addressed the House on the subject of certain wire service photos and reports published in various newspapers regarding recent events within Da Nang's besieged Tinh Hoi Pagoda in Vietnam.

I called attention to the discrepancies between the AP and the UPI pictures and captions and a story filed by Richard Critchfield, Asian correspondent for the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, and I simply requested a clarification.

I now submit for the RECORD the replies to my request for clarification of these discrepancies which I received from the UPI, AP, and the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, and I commend them and their staff photographers and reporters in South Vietnam for their prompt and candid response to my request of May 25.

I especially commend to my colleagues and the American public the expanded reply of Richard Critchfield whose honest reporting has been confirmed by the replies I have received, and which was highly commended editorially by the Chicago Tribune on May 26, 1966. His factual reporting is in the highest tradition of our free press, and adds significantly to our understanding of the tragic events in Vietnam.

It may be helpful to emphasize a point I made in an interview published in the June 4, 1966, issue of Editor & Publisher, that—

Editors should certainly look into the matter if questionable pictures of this nature continue to crop up. They owe it to their readers to see to it that propaganda masked as news is not allowed to infiltrate our newspapers.

For, as I pointed out in my floor remarks on May 25:

If one single picture or one single major news story can be questioned for accuracy and factual background, then the American public should know this so that they may judge their newspapers accordingly. We expect propaganda in the Communist press. Certainly our own free press should not be subject to such a charge.

The replies I have received from UPI, AP, and the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, as well as the lead editorial from the Chicago Tribune to which I referred earlier, follow:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 26, 1966.
Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In the spirit of fairness, the United Press International requests you take equal time on the floor and set the record straight concerning your charge yesterday that we misled the public with a picture from Saigon Sunday of a wounded woman and baby.

The fact is that the woman and the baby were wounded in the civil conflict near a

12318

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 9, 1966

Buddhist pagoda in Da Nang. The fact is that they lay wounded on a stretcher in the courtyard of the pagoda when reporters and staff photographers of various U.S. news media arrived, including UPI Staff Photographer Steve Van Meter. The fact is that there were about 30 staff correspondents and news photographers of U.S. media at the scene. They testify at length that they did not feel they were trapped in the pagoda by the Buddhists, but moved freely as gunfire permitted. The fact is that the head monk, Thich Minh Chieu, had called a news conference at the pagoda. The fact is that the woman was alive, not dead, and we state that on the testimony of several correspondents, and on the basis of a sequence of still newscast pictures.

The fact is there were many other wounded and dead, including more than 30 bodies in one room and another wounded woman on a stretcher in the courtyard near the woman and baby. The fact is that the pagoda was the nearest place with a dispensary not a hospital, but more than a first aid station. The woman and baby apparently were injured by mortar fire and were brought to the pagoda by Boy Scouts.

The fact is the woman and baby picture was not (repeat not) set up or staged by any representatives of the U.S. media. The question then is whether the Buddhists had staged the scene prior to arrival of photographers and newsmen. Our representatives and several other do not think so. The wounds were fresh, as if they had just been brought in. The fact is that Richard Critchfield of the Washington Star said in Saigon yesterday that he did not (repeat not) see anyone prop the baby up beside the woman, nor did he see the woman and the baby brought in. "Maybe these were not staged," he said, "but there were so many other things that were going on that you had to realize that these things were being staged. For instance, the bodies of two monks draped on the steps of another pagoda. The Buddhist Boy Scouts who ran out under fire and dragged the bodies back into the pagoda—just so they could claim their wounded. Some of them they wounded themselves."

Other newsmen disputed the charge against the Boy Scouts. Leon Daniel, UPI staff correspondent, said "I felt they were heroic. I certainly don't think they were risking their lives that way for propaganda purposes." Sean Flynn, a free lance for several large publications, said: "I've pictures of those kids. I'll fight Critchfield on that point." The fact remains that a civilian woman and baby were injured in civil strife and it was a legitimately newsworthy picture. If the Buddhists called a new conference to use the U.S. media it was used no more than by any other individual or group which calls news conferences to present views. The UPI has experienced newsmen and photographers in Vietnam and all of us are dedicated to objective, accurate reporting. The final fact is that we strive for that every day.

Sincerely,

CHARLES McCARTHY,
Assistant General Manager,
UPI News Pictures.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
May 27, 1966]

AP, UPI DENY VIET PHOTO WAS POSED

The Associated Press and United Press International, responding to a congressional challenge, have denied that their photographs of a Vietnamese woman and baby, taken during the recent civil strife at Da Nang, were posed.

In separate statements, the news agencies replied to earlier remarks in the House Wednesday by Rep. HARRIS B. McDowell, D-Del. McDowell had said there was an

apparent discrepancy between photographs transmitted by both AP and UPI and a news dispatch from Richard Critchfield, Asian correspondent of The Star.

The news services each distributed a photograph of a woman lying wounded on a stretcher, with a baby beside her, taken Sunday night inside the courtyard of a pagoda. Newsmen had been summoned there by Buddhists opposing the Saigon government for an announcement.

Critchfield, in his dispatch Tuesday, reported the newsmen had been "enticed inside for a fictional urgent announcement, then were told it was too dangerous to leave for the remainder of the night after Buddhist forces provoked a heavy fire fight with surrounding paratroopers and tanks."

He contended the entire incident had been staged as a propaganda show for the American reporters and photographers. He wrote, "perhaps the most cynical and outrageous touch was a wailing baby someone had propped against the body of a dead woman for the photographers' benefit."

McDowell, said that either AP and UPI photographers or Critchfield were guilty of "inaccurate and irresponsible" reporting.

The wire services, in their statements, yesterday, said picture sequences clearly established the woman their photographers pictured was not dead. They said their men had not posed the photograph, and did not think it had been posed.

Critchfield, replying from Saigon, conceded the woman may have been alive as "I did not feel the woman's pulse," but defended his reporting of the entire episode in the pagoda as accurately portraying the scene.

"Congressman McDowell's contention that it was either a question of inaccuracy by the photographers or myself—if, indeed, we are discussing the same woman and baby—is open to question. The photographer's job is to take pictures of what exists. A reporter's job is to try to and tell what is happening as best he can."

"A wounded or dead woman lay on the ground with a wailing baby by her side. That is a news photograph by any standard. But the circumstances and the setting surrounding her were equally important to convey. That is the reporter's job: To describe what he sees and to place the event in context and proper perspective."

"What I attempted to point out was that when we (some 40 newsmen) walked into that pagoda, an array of wounded and dead bodies—including a woman and a child—were lying around in an apparently-staged display. That was the immediate impression of those newsmen around me."

"The wounded badly needed medical attention and the Buddhist monks there had the ability to get them out if they wanted, as they later demonstrated."

Critchfield went on to recount what he called the "nightmarish experience of being temporarily trapped within the pagoda." When the newsmen arrived, he said, it was almost dark.

Once inside the pagoda gates, they saw youths and women swathed in bloody bandages lying about the courtyard. Four women lay on stretchers on the ground just before the pagoda steps. Off to the side was a woman with a baby.

"The woman's eyes were closed and she appeared to be dead," Critchfield continued. "A very small baby—perhaps less than 1 year old—apparently had been placed by her side near the waist. It was crying and held its arms toward us and did not appear to be injured. I did not feel the woman's pulse."

"From the nearby classroom came the stench from 26 bodies, many of them putrefied."

He added:

"A number of reporters voiced fears we had walked into a trap and others voiced disgust at the display of the wounded."

REPORTER WOUNDED

The AP, in its statement written after checking its Saigon office, said one of its reporters, Robert Poos, said that the woman in question "was not dead nor was the picture posed. The picture sequence taken by an AP staff photographer showed the mother's arms in three different positions."

Poos was wounded in the chest as he left the pagoda grounds.

UPI, in a statement by Charles McCarty, assistant general manager of UPI news pictures, urged McDowell to "set the record straight concerning your charges yesterday that we misled the public with a picture from Saigon Sunday...."

McCarty also said:

"The fact is the woman and baby picture was not set up or staged by any representative of the U.S. media. The question then is whether the Buddhists had staged the scene prior to arrival of photographers and newsmen."

"Our representatives and several others do not think so.... If the Buddhists called a news conference to use the U.S. media it was used no more than by any other individual or group which calls news conferences to present views."

Critchfield does not say the photographers staged the picture. He does contend that the Buddhists summoned the newsmen to the pagoda after staging a scene to elicit sympathy—and support—for their position.

REPORT OF RICHARD CRITCHFIELD, ASIAN CORRESPONDENT FOR THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR, ON PAGODA PICTURES AND STORIES (Associated Press, New York—Washington Star special)

SAIGON, May 28.—Saigon Vietnamese newspapers this morning published statements from both American press Services made in response to charges by Rep. McDowell concerning newscast taken in Danang last Sunday night.

McDowell cited article by this reporter written Tuesday contending propaganda scene had been staged within Pagoda deliberately to picture South Vietnamese military forces as slaughtering innocent women and children.

He quoted one scene in my Tuesday dispatch "Perhaps the most cynical and outrageous touch was a wailing baby someone had propped against the body of a dead woman for the photographers' benefit."

Though McDowell did not refer to it I also had written in previous story Monday "the Pagoda precinct itself covering about a fourth of city block, was a grisly nightmare scene. Twenty-six corpses some packed in salt and others badly decomposed and covered with Buddhist flags swarming with flies gave whole area sickening stench. Stretchers of wounded women and teenage boys wrapped with bloody bandages lay about the courtyard as if they were on display for the foreign press. This tragic spectacle included one dead woman with a wailing baby."

The controversial story was written following day in effort to put this scene in more perspective. It was intended as analysis. As I have pointed out while AP photograph does not entirely resemble what I remembered it is possible I was mistaken.

It all happened quickly—we were invited to pagoda, fired at as we entered, milled about in semidarkness and confusion, a rebel youth grabbed me by shoulder to see what he said was example government repression and I saw woman who to all appearances was dead. Have vivid impression of black hair bloody bandages and baby visibly terrified and crying raising its arms to be taken away. Moments later heavy firefighting erupted and bullets sprayed courtyard and I did not see woman and baby again. I understand AP is trying to trace her.

Associated Press Statement which was accurate and fair quotes this reporter as saying I did not mean to imply specific picture of woman and child were "posed and set up as a fake" by foreign newsman. I have known some of photographers involved for two years and they are brave skilled newsmen dedicated to objective accurate journalism.

What I did however, intend was to interpret entire spectacle at Tinh Hoi as I and some of the other newsmen present saw it: A flagrant example of stagemanaging by a extremely skillful propaganda apparatus.

Whether rebels intended to hold us hostage to ensure their own protection or involve American Marines or simply to play on our sympathies matter of speculation. But that certain aspects of scene contrived for calculated effect I had no doubt whatsoever.

Since some newsmen present then remained in Danang and others returned to Saigon and elsewhere and civil strife has continued have had no oportunity to canvass everybody present. APS Robert Poos yesterday confirmed I had quoted him accurately as saying the "Buddists had trapped us in the pagoda and then opened fire when we tried to go."

Ruben Salazar of Los Angeles Times confirms Thich Minh Chieu chief Monk in pagoda told newsmen he had invited them there for express purpose of witnessing government attack he expected either that night or early morning.

Simon Petrie a French correspondent for Paris Match and other publications whose Danang home was ransacked by government troops two days before said yesterday he shared my belief spectacle of wounded staged for our benefit.

Francois Sully of Newsweek Magazine reported his subsequent research in Danang substantiated what I had written.

Dale Minor of WBAR New York who recorded most of the sounds in pagoda on his taperecorder said yesterday he was convinced government troops had twice "raked the courtyard" with machine gun fire while we were there and wounded lay exposed in open.

Ronald Nessen of NBC and William Stout of CBS who shared same ditch during first heavy fire fight both expressed conviction at time rebels had provoked government fire to trap us in pagoda. No rebel ever expressly forbade us to leave. But several told me after fire fight roughly same message "it is too dangerous now for you to leave before morning."

David Kelly of London Economist who left Danang Sunday afternoon said yesterday he had seen considerable evidence of rebel stagemanaging events during his two day stopover in Danang.

Kelly felt controversy produced "a healthier situation". Kelly said while he felt monks at TinHoi had shown respect for dead by arranging bodies and observing traditional ceremonies, two monks found sprawled dead in pagoda entrance Friday morning had definitely staged appearance and had not been decently cared for.

He also noted as I did that although pagoda reportedly defended by rebel battalion which I had actually seen day before there was only one dead soldier's body in evidence.

UPI in its statement asked McDowell to set record straight and enumerated list of facts. It contended thirty reporters on scene "can testify at length that they did not feel trapped in the pagoda by the Buddhists but moved freely as gunfire permitted."

This testimony should be recorded and publicized to set the record straight. Most of the other newsmen I talked to shared Poos belief we had been enticed into pagoda to trap us. Through most of the episode newsmen were in three separate groups. I was with what appeared to be two television teams, NBC and CBS.

Two tracer bullets were fired straight over our heads from pagoda gate as we approached pagoda. At this point Neil Sheehan of New York Times and one other newsmen near rear of group turned back to American Press camp.

About dozen of us were too close to pagoda by then to feel could safely retreat but from that moment all of us felt frightened and uneasy if not trapped. Others already inside possibly felt easier in their minds.

Within minutes however six or seven newsmen although urgent announcement had not yet been made—and never was—attempted to leave pagoda, were fired upon and wounded by grenade fragments. One photographer I saw voiced real panic. Another a vietnamese handed his camera over to his American employer and said no matter what he was getting out.

Everyone I saw with exception of one heroic voice who shouted across courtyard "I am staying all night" was either angry or frightened and many could be accurately described as terrified.

UPI mentions pagoda was nearest place with dispensary which was true. But a heavily armored battalion had surrounded its rear at five o'clock triggering heavy fire fight and rebels later triggered another between seven and eight when we were inside pagoda. According to APS investigation woman and baby were mortar fire victims and had been found hiding and brought by Buddhist boyscouts near house some two hundred yards away to pagoda compound. This was during daylight since darkness fell only when we reached the gate. During daylight hours ambulances and other vehicles had been coming and going from pagoda all day.

When we arrived rebels voiced fears of imminent government attack. These included apparent leader Thich Minh Chieu.

My contention was that wounded could have been carried away from pagoda to safety and help down the street since only four government tanks on that side. My contention was that to bring them to pagoda endangered their lives both from lack of medical care and exposure to incoming bullets since they were left lying in exposed courtyard.

Friday afternoon Kenneth Harbridge of Philadelphia one of two American businessmen sharing house two blocks away from pagoda told me it was his impression most of wounded civilians in area has been hit by rebel fire whether rescued by Buddhist boyscouts or not.

Harbridge a former Army major said he had seen rebels laying boobytraps in streets and small boys running back and forth with grenades under their shirts.

His house was hit with mortar wounding landlady and a servant blown up by streetmine. Harbridge put blame for both on rebels.

UPI noted I had said I had not seen anyone prop up baby nor had I seen woman or baby brought in. This is true. But woman I saw dead or alive was in no condition to look after that child and somebody would have had to prop it there which was what I reported.

There was also testimony Buddhist boyscouts had acted heroically rescuing wounded under fire. I agree one hundred percent. My belief was that like highschool girls and others in pagoda the boyscouts were being used as unconscious instruments of a cynical propaganda apparatus involving only a handful of leaders. One of topmost Buddhist leaders told me Thursday that "romantic idealistic" youths made best agitators. My experience in Danang was that many rebel soldiers, boyscouts, highschool girls and others took part out of good faith in what felt was good cause. Brig. Gen. Du Quoc Dong in interview expressed much same view as his national rank and file of rebels should not be punished.

What really happened during those confused moments in Tin Hoi could probably be accurately determined by interviewing each of newsmen involved, Marine officers at press camp and most of several hundred Vietnamese wounded during the entire week. A careful study could be made of rebel propaganda apparatus. This would require United States government resources since newsmen must go on and report continuing daily events. The issue is profoundly important one in Vietnam and should not be lost in secondary matter of whether picture was faked. Of course it was not and this reporter never meant to imply it was. The stagemanaging was done on much vaster scale and this propaganda apparatus is what should be investigated and accused, not the press services. End Critchfield

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, May 26, 1966]

THE SCALES FELL FROM THEIR EYES

One of the most significant news stories of the Viet Nam war was written by Richard Critchfield, a distinguished Washington Star correspondent, distributed by the Associated Press, and published by The Tribune yesterday.

Mr. Critchfield's dispatch is conclusive evidence that some of the reporting from Viet Nam has been the worst in our history, which is a major reason why the American people are so confused about it.

The story recounts the horrible experience of 40 American and foreign newsmen who were lured into Da Nang's Buddhist Tinh Hoi pagoda, besieged by government troops, by revolutionary monks who promised them an important statement. When they arrived the newsmen were told that it was too dangerous for them to leave, and they soon realized that the treacherous monks had enticed them into the pagoda as hostages. Either their presence would deter government troops from assaulting the pagoda or, if it should be stormed, the surviving newsmen would put the blame for the attack on military forces loyal to Premier Ky.

Mr. Critchfield describes the experience of the newsmen as "a kind of shock treatment that stripped bare the almost incredible cynicism of Buddhist monks and rebel political commissars toward human life." The incident, he says, exploded the myth that the Buddhists represented "a just but repressed popular cause." He says the "scales fell from the eyes" of the naive newsmen who had helped to propagate this myth.

Despite the risk of being shot in the back by the Buddhist rebels, the newsmen, as Mr. Critchfield says, decided to "stand up for human decency." They turned their backs on the monks, marched out, waving handkerchiefs and undershirts, and three of them were injured by rebel snipers and a grenade.

Mr. Critchfield has a reputation for honest, objective reporting. Unlike many others in Viet Nam, he has not distorted facts to support some ideological predilection. But he is an idealist, and he had sincerely believed that the Buddhist insurrection was a popular movement. He was the closest American correspondent in Viet Nam to Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, deposed former commander of the 1st corps area and political ally of the infamous Thich Tri Quang, leader of the Buddhist rebels. Thus his account of the revelation in the Tinh Hoi pagoda is a confession of immense significance.

The Buddhist tactics described by Mr. Critchfield are characteristically communist and wholly incompatible with the self-denying ascetic, and gentle attitudes of Buddhism. They debased their own religious sanctuary, refusing to bury their dead on the pretense that government troops would not let them out of the pagoda, when trucks flying Red Cross flags were coming and going with arms and ammunition. They armed Boy Scouts and induced them to fire and throw

June 9, 1966

grenades at government troops, who could not return the fire without killing children and creating martyrs for the Buddhists.

Marshal Ky has said that Tri Quang is certainly a communist sympathizer and probably a communist. It is known from captured enemy documents that the rebellious Buddhist groups were infiltrated and strongly influenced by the Communists. The anti-government and anti-American slogans used in all Buddhist demonstrations were dictated by the Communist party.

All these facts have been reported by the Tribune.

STRUGGLE TO PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT FROM POLLUTION ENLISTS TALENTS OF ABLE MEN FROM MANY DIFFERENT PROFESSIONS

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MR. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the struggle to protect our environment from pollution has enlisted the talents of able men from many different professions. I would like to take occasion to pay tribute to a man who represents, with honor, that group of skilled and sophisticated engineers who have done so much in recent years to make this a healthier nation in which to live.

This week Mr. Harry G. Hanson, Associate Chief for Environmental Health and an Assistant Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service is leaving that organization after nearly 25 years of dedicated service.

Many Members of this Congress have become increasingly aware of the importance of combatting pollution of the environment as a menace to human health, as well as to important aesthetic and economic values. As a member and chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the annual budget of the Public Health Service, I have been impressed with the tremendous task we confront in combatting a multitude of pollutants. I have also come to respect the engineers who were among the first of the professional groups to realize the significance of the problem and to devise methods of containing it. Among these pioneers in a new and complex area of modern life, Mr. Hansen has filled an important role.

As director of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, from 1954 to 1960 he contributed to the strength of that facility and helped make it a pivotal resource in all our environmental health efforts to the point that it became internationally famous. As Associate Chief for Environmental Health since 1960, he has earned respect for his professional ability and his personal integrity.

Mr. Hanson has not only served well the people of this Nation. He has shared knowledge and skill and carried a message of hope to the people of other countries. On two occasions Mr. Hanson served as adviser to U.S. delegations of the World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, and he has ably represented our country in other international conferences.

I am confident his experience and skill will serve this Nation well when Mr. Hanson assumes his new post as Regional Adviser for Sanitary Engineering with the Pan American Health Organization.

On my own behalf and for Mr. Hanson's many other friends in Congress, I extend best wishes to Mr. Hanson for success in his new endeavors. I would also add our thanks and appreciation for his significant contributions to the furtherance of public health, as he has unremittingly devoted himself to the health of people and their environment over a quarter century of public service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. GRAY), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DORN, for 1 hour, on June 16.

Mr. MOELLER, for 15 minutes, on June 13.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) for 15 minutes, on June 14; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and included extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 30 minutes today: revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 30 minutes, on June 13; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WHITTEN and to include a letter to the editor by Benjamin Schultz, of Clarksdale, Miss.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. DAIR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana to extend his remarks at the close of debate on H.R. 14929 today.

Mr. DAGUE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HARVEY of Indiana) to extend his remarks at the close of debate on H.R. 14929 today.

Mr. SPRINGER to extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 14929 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. DOLE to extend his remarks immediately prior to the vote on the Callan amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MIZE (at the request of Mr. DOLE) to extend his remarks immediately prior to the vote on the Callan amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. DOLE) to extend his remarks immediately prior to the vote on the Callan amendment in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. QUIE to include extraneous matter with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) following the remarks of Mr. QUIE in Committee today and to include certain detailed information.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. QUILLIN.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. WIDNALL in two instances.

Mr. DOLE.

Mr. MACGREGOR in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEOGH in two instances.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. BURKE.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. LOVE in two instances.

Mr. HAYS in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. FUQUA.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. VIVIAN.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. FARNUM and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$364.

SENATE BILLS, A JOINT RESOLUTION, AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 562. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities," and to eliminate certain requirements for the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration in Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2366. An act to repeal certain provisions of the act of January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091).

Port Authority and the MBTA, but it presents serious problems of integration with other functional and administrative units.

A third approach is the development of truly metropolitan government. This appears to be working successfully in Dade County, Florida and should be carefully studied for possible application elsewhere.

Whatever the advantages of strong central coordination, I think that our experience over the past three decades demonstrates that the problems of our urban society are too complex and too imminent to be susceptible of central operation. We can ease the administrative difficulties through the application of the techniques of modern management to urban problems. The genius of systems technology is its ability to bring order out of tremendous numbers of diverse elements and factors—order that not only stabilizes but creates the conditions for progress as well. These concepts, developed so brilliantly right here in Eastern Massachusetts, are already being put to use on public problems. The State of California contracted with four aerospace firms for studies on crime, transportation, pollution and information control. Computers will govern the scheduling and repair of trains in the new Bay Area Rapid Transit system in San Francisco. Experiments are now going forward in Toronto and Chicago with the use of computers to regulate traffic. There is enormous room for greater efforts here. It is at this point that our technology most directly confronts the urban challenge.

Implicit in everything I have said about strengthening governmental institutions below the national level is the essential validity of government close to the people. One of the failures of our approach to urban problems thus far is the inability of programs of concrete and granite to transform the lives of people. This failure goes to the heart of the second question I raised a few minutes ago. Who is to govern?

The historic ideal of the town meeting where each citizen of the community could speak his piece and influence the decisions of the government closest to him is simply not feasible in a city of millions. What we must strive for is a system of metropolitan government that will give people the sense of participation and involvement envisioned by the town meeting. This will not be achieved simply by establishing quotas of representation on city boards and agencies of "the poor" or any other category of citizen. I am convinced that the consistently low turnout in elections conducted by the Office of Economic Opportunity reflects the inability of the citizens involved to believe that their representation would really make any difference. People will seek redress in the streets until they believe they can find it in the voting booth. One of my former colleagues in the House is making an exciting attempt to restore the confidence of people in government in New York City. We can only wish him well and hope that his example will be repeated elsewhere in the nation.

In discussing with you some of the elements in the urban challenge that concern me as a Member of Congress, I fear I have raised more questions than I have answered. Those of us who must operate within the confines of existing geographic and administrative divisions look to those of you with the freshness and imagination to develop new forms of government suitable to the age, yet consistent with our tested principles.

It is an awesome challenge, but one from which we cannot turn away. In confronting it, we might reflect upon our history. Almost two hundred years ago the people living on the Atlantic Coast of this continent came together to govern a great nation; it is our challenge here today to come together to develop new and fresh approaches to the government of great cities.

Representative Smith of New York Lauds Australian Economic and Military Assistance in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1966

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, many Americans, I believe, are under the impression that the United States is "going it alone" in Vietnam; that only American forces are struggling to preserve the cause of freedom in that embattled nation. It is true that our fighting men, representing every branch of our Armed Forces, are shouldering the greatest part of the burden in growing concern the fact that, for the past 5 weeks, the number of American men killed in action in Vietnam have exceeded the number of South Vietnamese war dead.

American is a great and powerful nation. She has never shirked her responsibilities to preserve and protect the principles of freedom and democracy whenever and wherever she has been called upon to do so.

There are, however, other nations, though not possessed of the industrial and military might of the United States, who feel a deep sense of responsibility to those peoples who lack the blessings of liberty and human freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call particular attention to the economic and military assistance being provided in Vietnam by the Commonwealth of Australia.

I know that our combat units in Vietnam are happy to have the cooperation and support of the courageous, gallant and experienced Australian troops. It is good to know that some of our friends around the world understand the reasons for our involvement in Vietnam.

Australia is a nation which has faced aggression, invasion and the loss of freedom and liberty before. She knows the cost of peace, and she is willing to pay the price to preserve that peace both for herself and her neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the June 1 edition of the Australian News, published by the Australian News and Information Bureau, contains a very interesting commentary by the Australian Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Paul Hasluck, on Australia's position with regard to Vietnam and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. I commend this article to the study of the members of the House.

The following are pertinent excerpts from the Australian News:

AUSTRALIAN EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER SETS OUT VIEWS ON RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VIETNAM POLICY AND SEATO MEMBERSHIP

The Australian Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Paul Hasluck, has spoken of Australia's actions in Vietnam and their relationship to the South-East Asia Treaty Organization. In a statement released yesterday, Mr. Hasluck said that because questions continued to be asked on this subject he was recapitulating the Government's attitude and policy.

The Minister said that when the SEATO Treaty was signed in 1954, its eight members designated for the purposes of Article IV "the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam." This meant that each party to the Treaty recognized that aggression against South Vietnam by armed attack would endanger its own peace and safety and each agreed that it would in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

"The designation also meant that, if it was considered that South Vietnam was threatened other than by armed attack, the parties would consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defence," Mr. Hasluck said. "Article IV also states that it is understood that no action on the territory of a designated State should be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the Government concerned. The objectives of SEATO are those which the Australian Government has been steadily pursuing for many years.

"That was why, 12 years ago, we worked hard to have SEATO created, and to have South Vietnam designated by protocol. It would be wrong to say that the Australian Government is acting today in Vietnam solely because it is obliged to do so under SEATO. Even if SEATO did not exist, Australia would want to see communist aggression deterred and resisted in the region of South and South-East Asia.

"SEATO helps to deter and resist aggression. SEATO is an agreement and a working practical arrangement which Australia adheres to and observes in pursuit of our own interests and policies. Our actions in SEATO are in pursuance of our obligations through SEATO but are not because of SEATO alone. The Treaty does not itself lay down the details of action to be taken to meet a threat or an act of aggression. The members meet together as required to discuss situations and possible courses of action.

"Unanimity of all SEATO members is necessary for the designation of South Vietnam by protocol and this was agreed unanimously. But unanimity is not required for every action by each member State in playing its part in SEATO. Possible action by SEATO members is not limited, under the Treaty or otherwise, to collective action. Obligations under the Treaty are separate as well as joint, and members have to make their separate judgements.

"In the absence of a collective decision—which in the question of Vietnam has not been sought—each State decides for itself what it will do. Australia decided initially, in 1954, to contribute to the stability and development of the Republic of Vietnam by economic assistance. Such assistance has continued ever since. Then, as Vietcong insurrection, sabotage, and terrorism sought to disrupt the administration and economy of South Vietnam and to destroy it, the Australian Government gave additional and new forms of assistance—for example, military advisers. When the situation worsened, with more blatant and large-scale armed intervention from North Vietnam, the Australian Government increased its assistance yet further and provided combat forces.

"The form of our response to the threat to South Vietnam was not determined by SEATO. It was for Australia to decide for itself the nature and size of the action we took. Other countries, more remote or perhaps feeling themselves less directly threatened or less able to assist others, might have taken a different view. But the Australian Government considered that the situation called for assistance to the Republic of Vietnam against aggression, and that it was in our national interest and within our national capacity to do no less than we are doing now

officials in search of information and to be sure that we are not working at cross purposes. We still need an Office of Community Development.

Every Member of Congress and every Senator has seen the problems faced by communities in their efforts to deal with the federal government. Not only must an official go from the Department to Department in search of information, but he must also frequently go from bureau to bureau within those departments. The agencies do little to ease the burdens of these local officials. Recently, my office collected the information and application forms needed by urban officials to apply for federal grants or loans. The size of the pile is staggering. The community applying for a senior citizens housing project, for example, must wade its way through a fact sheet on the program, the regulations governing its administration, an explanation of the form that must be submitted to assure compliance with the regulations, the assurance of compliance form, another explanation of the form for the loan, and the loan form itself, a pamphlet on guides for project design, a supplemental information sheet, information on fallout shelter requirements, instructions on how to apply for organizational and development expenses, and model forms of incorporation and bylaws. Then we come to the supplemental forms: the statement of housing demand, the official certification of authority, the statement of community interest, project characteristics data, engineering data, site data, financial data, legal data—all this for a single program! We also found that the manuals and materials needed by a community to file an application for a Head Start program under the Office of Economic Opportunity weighed 5½ pounds! Furthermore the economic data required is not systematic or uniform. Similar but related calculations must be performed over and over again.

But if the Executive Branch has failed in its responsibilities for coordination, the Congress has done little better. At the present time, there are no less than eight standing committees of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over urban programs. The Committees on Agriculture, Banking and Currency, the District of Columbia, Education and Labor, Government Operations, Judiciary, Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Public Works all have significant areas of jurisdiction over urban problems. Given this wide dispersal of authority, coordination is practically impossible. In some instances our Committees may even be working at cross purposes. For example, while the Public Works Committee is considering legislation to build more highways to bring cars into the central city, the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee may be working on mass transit legislation designed to keep the cars out.

Water pollution is another example. The Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction over programs funded by the Community Facilities Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for new sewage systems, while the Public Works Committee has jurisdiction over water pollution control programs, which funds the construction of water treatment facilities. The relationship between these two urban functions is far closer in fact than this jurisdictional arrangement would suggest. The present system makes it impossible to consider the interrelationships between housing and education, between transportation and pollution, or between highways and open spaces.

The wise response to this confused situation would be to create a Committee of the House of Representatives on Urban Affairs. Since I entered the House in 1961, I have been introducing resolutions calling for a select

or standing Committee on Urban Affairs. As federal involvement in urban affairs grows, so does interest in these proposals and I am hopeful that action can be obtained in the relatively near future.

The value of such a committee has been demonstrated clearly this year. The President has recommended a Demonstration Cities Act that would encompass such programs as transportation, housing, urban renewal, welfare and economic opportunity. House consideration of this proposal could be much more meaningful if an Urban Affairs Committee, benefiting from the expertise of Members from the eight Committees now charged with responsibility in this field could have brought their mutual wisdom and understanding to the consideration of this major new legislation. Here, it seems to me, is an opportunity for the Congress to do the coordinating job the Administration is not doing.

The point of this discussion of administrative arrangements is that there are a number of immediate steps that can be taken in the short run to smooth the relationships between urban areas and the federal government. In the long run, however, we must look beyond the easy administrative shortcuts to a whole new concept of government. Nowhere is this more evident than right here in Megalopolis. As Professor Jean Gottman points out in his detailed study, the concept comes from the Alexandrian philosopher Philo Judaeus who referred to "megalopolis" as a great city of ideas which could predetermine and command the material world. We have never needed ideas so badly.

Any consideration of the government of urbanization comes down to two basic questions: what is to be the jurisdiction and structure of government? Who is to govern?

It is clear that local governments are hard pressed to cope with the pressures of urbanization. The traditional view of the community as the center of work and play, or public and private life has undergone drastic revision. No longer do many of our people live and work in the same place. Our suburbs have been the site of a tremendous influx of population bringing with it demands for services, schools and recreational facilities. The industrial base that could help finance these needs has not come so quickly. By the same token, the increase in commuting has brought a greater devotion of central city land to parking lots and garages which generate less revenue for essential city services. Even when industry begins to follow the flight to the suburbs the revenue balance cannot be righted.

In large part the financial crisis of both city and suburb results from the reliance of these governmental units on the property tax as the principal source of revenue. We have already noted the weakness of this base. We should also note that in the City of Boston, for example, more than 36% of the land is exempt from property taxation.

We also see local governments competing for external sources of revenue. States compete for the revenue generated by residents whose place of employment is located outside the state. Cities compete with suburbs and up-state areas for their share of state revenue. And all of this takes place within the framework of increasing federal contributions to the solution of urban problems. Many communities have found that the federal matching grant programs restrict their freedom to budget because they feel they must earmark available funds to programs that will generate federal dollars even though other more pressing needs should be met.

It is becoming increasingly clear that our cities must either receive considerably more help from other levels of government, or be granted power to raise additional revenue on their own.

One possible source of assistance immediately comes to mind. As the Heller Plan for the sharing of federal revenue with the states

has appeared to lose favor with the Administration, it has gained support in Congress. With a number of my Republican colleagues in the House and Senator JAVITS in the Senate, I have introduced legislation authorizing the return of one per cent of federal income tax revenue to the states. The funds, which would amount to about \$2.5 billion in the first year, could be used for a broad range of health, education and welfare purposes. These might include pollution control, mental health and retardation prevention and treatment, expanded programs of special and supplementary education—the list is endless. There would be a minimum federal control; funds would be allocated among states according to a careful formula reflecting population and need; and essential direction and execution would remain at the local level.

In my judgment, this approach could lessen federal administrative costs, permit greater flexibility in programming, and allow the allocation of funds more promptly and selectively.

We are undergoing a vast revolution in the representative character of our state governments. If the governments which result from this revolution more accurately represent the interests of their people and if they approach their task with freshness and vision, they will be better able to develop and administer their own programs. If we give these strengthened governments better tools to work with, the benefits for metropolitan development become even more evident.

We cannot talk about local government without assessing the revolution that has already overtaken it. The geographic boundaries and historic charters that once created obvious administrative divisions are no longer of central importance. Rivers, bays and mountains are no longer barriers to communication, nor does their presence automatically create a community of interest. What are some of the factors that bind communities together? Functional interests have already been the foundation for hundreds of new governmental units: agencies and boards to run airports and ports, to administer reservoirs, to build highways and to educate children. The resident of Boston is governed not only by the city government, but by the Massachusetts Port Authority, the Metropolitan District Commission, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and a plethora of other boards and commission. It is questionable whether the overlay of additional government units on top of traditional local government is an incentive or a barrier to sensible regional development. How can we combine community of interest with ease of administration?

It is arguable, for example, that the 21 towns that include portions of the Route 128 complex within its boundaries is less able to govern that area than some sort of functional administrative unit. No doubt the 574 firms and their 54,500 employees have a great deal in common, perhaps more so than with other members of their present geographic communities. But by the same token, these firms and individuals share but one basic interest. There are others which they share with members of their present communities, perhaps to a greater degree. It is here, it seems to me that the concept of functional government breaks down.

We must seek the proper mix between functional and geographic limits in the assignment of responsibility for urban government and administration. The alternatives for local government are at least three. The first is annexation. A city can simply keep acquiring land and welding it into a single administrative unit. This cannot go on indefinitely however, particularly in an areas as large as megalopolis, where appropriate administrative divisions cross state boundaries.

The second alternative is delegation of governmental power to specific administrative units. This approach has tremendous utility as we have seen with the New York

"Our economic aid, and our military aid, has been given in response to requests from the Government of Vietnam. The Security Council of the United Nations was informed of our decision to give military assistance. Australia is not the only member of SEATO giving assistance to the Republic of Vietnam: the United States of America, New Zealand, and Thailand are doing so. The Republic of Korea, which is not a member of SEATO, is supplying forces.

"Many other countries throughout the world are providing civil assistance. The common objectives are to deter and repel aggression and to help the victim of aggression.

Salute to Republic of the Philippines Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1966

MR. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, the people of the Philippine Republic will celebrate their independence anniversary. I am proud to extend my congratulations and warm felicitations to His Excellency Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Philippines; and to His Excellency Oscar Ledesma, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States.

The Republic has always been a source of inspiration to me because since it was granted its freedom from the United States in 1946 the Filipino people have upheld the faith and hope that we in America had in them. They have also remained in high esteem as trusted friends of the American people. The dedication and hard work and sacrifice of such famous Filipino heroes as Emilio Aguinaldo, Manuel Luiz Quezon, Sergio Osmeña, and Ramon Magsaysay have borne fruit in a thriving and prosperous Philippine Republic.

During the Spanish-American War the United States gained control over the Philippines. It was long our intention to encourage the growth of truly democratic institutions and popular government in the territory. The people learned their lesson well, and on July 4, 1946, our beloved stars and stripes were lowered and the flag of the independent and sovereign Philippine Republic was hoisted. The Republic now recognizes June 12 as its independence anniversary, and each yearly celebration finds the people that much richer and fuller in the experience of directing their own affairs.

America and the Philippines have long enjoyed warm relations and those ties have drawn even closer as a result of fighting together against the Japanese during World War II and against the Communist forces in Korea. Stability in areas such as southeast Asia depends largely on the success or lack thereof registered by countries like the Philippines. It is my fervent hope that the Philippines, entering a new year of independence, will continue to register the achievement and progress it so earnestly seeks.

I am very proud to extend best wishes to the Government and people of the Philippines and congratulate them on their anniversary.

Still a Great Big Wonderful World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1966

MR. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Rome Daily American of June 2, 1966, with reference to Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.:

STILL A GREAT BIG WONDERFUL WORLD

(By Ernest Cuneo)

NEW YORK.—Big Jim Farley was 78 years old this week. He celebrated it with his usual 78-hour week. Since his last birthday, he has attended 125 dinners and 70 luncheons at many of which he was principal speaker.

He also traveled 60,000 miles by land, sea, and air, visiting 20 countries, including all European capitals, all Central American capitals, and the principal cities of Mexico.

He reads the box scores of every major league ball game—without glasses—as part of his habit of reading at least four newspapers every day.

He is 6-feet 3-inches tall, literally in the well-known pink, and his 205 pounds haven't varied in the last 20 years.

He has a most peculiar walk, one of very quick and very short steps. His towering figure seems to scoot through the New York winds, in spite of the fact that he is interrupted every 10 paces by someone who wants to shake his hand. Perhaps no man since Daniel Webster's Boston has so much received the adulation of a city.

New Yorkers give him the respect accorded Al Smith and the affection bestowed of Jim-my Walker.

There is an astonishing simplicity about this most sophisticated of men. He still has the clean wholesomeness of the lanky country boy who played first base for the town team 60 years ago. He brought this same zest to politics.

The Democratic Party was his team, and he gave it all he had.

From 8 a.m. every morning till six at night, he's in there pitching for his current team, Coca-Cola export. He's head of it, but he puts on no airs. He calls himself a salesman, and sell he does.

His office is crowded with affectionate greetings from popes to presidents, and from mail-carriers to matadors. All look as pleased as if they had just paused to refresh.

The Hudson River was brimming with the melting snows of the Great Blizzard of 1888 when Jim Farley uttered his birth-cry. As Damon Runyon would have said, it's 8 to 5 it was a shout of joy at being alive.

His enthusiasm has mounted ever since. All of humanity is his team, and he's glad to be on it. He not only likes people; he relishes them.

Jim was the second of five boys. His father was a Hudson River schooner captain, sailing bricks down to New York City. He prospered. He bought two small brickyards. But just before Jim was 10, his father went out to harness the horse to go to a neighbor's funeral. The halter was long, the horse frisky.

Suddenly wheeling, he kicked Capt. Farley in the chest. He died that night.

Ellen Goldrick Farley, Jim's mother, could run neither a schooner nor brickyards. Capt. Farley left no debts, small assets, sturdy bodies, an honorable name, and a great mother for his boys.

Jim promised his mother he would never touch an alcoholic drink, and he never has. He doesn't smoke either. These are tremendous advantages for a man to bring to the hard-dealing games in the smoke-filled rooms of politics.

Of course, Jim doesn't mind if other men drink, and they do. One senses, however, that it is a source of never-ending wonder to Jim that men will drink whiskey, when a bottle of you-know-what is immediately at hand.

For the sake of his friends, the company should put out a double-strength Farley-sized pinch bottle for men who need bracing as well as a pause.

Jim wanted to be town clerk. An Irish-American Catholic Democrat stood as much chance in the rock-ribbed Republican town of Grassy Point then as Mao Tse-tung stands of being elected governor of Utah now.

But Jim took to the mails. Apparently, Republicans like to receive letters because they elected him.

This started the most unbelievable romance in history between Jim Farley and the U.S. mails. He became postmaster-general of the United States, then practically a concomitant of being chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He deserved it as its chief customer alone.

Being at the head of the Post Office Department did not soothe his letter-writing propensities; it inflamed them. Following the 1932 campaign, he signed 22,000 first-name letters of thanks; in 1936, 27,000. And not when he got around to it; immediately.

Within a week after election, there were 27,000 families in thousands of cities and villages proudly exhibiting the letters of thanks with the famous green-ink signature.

Farley, a boy who never graduated from high school, has 22 honorary degrees. He, with President Herbert Hoover, were the two distinguished members of both parties selected to reorganize the U.S. executive department.

He has served on New York State's sacrosanct Banking Commission, and its Boxing Commission, and is currently on its Racing Commission. He can discuss as an expert whether foreign trade will expand. (He thinks it will multiply) or whether Mickey Mantle is swinging too hard. (He thinks he is).

Almost as a matter of routine, every major league player rounding first base at Yankee Stadium waves to Jim Farley in his box by the baseline.

About 10,000 letters poured into his office this week. The whole world waved to Jim Farley on his birthday.

And Big Jim beamed back. To him, it was a great big wonderful world. And, of course, things go even better with Coke.

Tax Treatment of Employees Reimbursed Moving Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1966

MR. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1966, I introduced H.R. 13070, to exclude from income certain reim-

bursed moving expenses. Since that date 30 of my colleagues have joined in support of this legislation and have introduced similar measures to correct the inequity created by the Internal Revenue Ruling 54-429.

Following is an article taken from the Wall Street Journal of June 8, 1966, which I believe points out the importance of this legislation:

A TAX ON FLEXIBILITY

With so much headline-catching legislation in Congress, few people are likely to pay much attention to a pending bill to liberalize tax treatment of employees' moving expenses. That's unfortunate, since the present rules are not only unfair to individuals and companies but to some extent are even lessening the economy's ability to adjust to change.

Under present regulations an employee can exclude from his taxable income only the actual amount his employer pays to move him, his family and his possessions to a job in another city. If his company, prior to the actual move, finances a house-hunting trip or arranges a hotel room for a few days until he can find a new home, he must report these and any similar outlays as income on his tax return.

The unfairness of this approach is clear to anyone who ever has been moved from one city to another by his employer. A transferred employee can avoid a house-hunt, for example, only by quitting his job or by refusing to move, which in some cases may amount to the same thing.

Some companies get around the problem by paying an about-to-move employee an allowance over and above his necessary expenses, just to cover his taxes. But smaller or less prosperous firms can't always afford to be so generous. The present procedure, in other words, discriminates in favor of big, thriving businesses—a rather unusual attitude for Washington.

The impact of the current rules cannot be measured precisely. Yet some employees unquestionably have become more reluctant to move, and some companies are either less willing or able to make the most productive use of their staffs.

Aware of the difficulties, bipartisan groups in both houses of Congress have introduced corrective legislation. Even if the bill can find its way to the top of a crowded Congressional calendar, though, it still faces the Treasury's opposition to tax measures involving a potential loss of a bit of revenue.

As a matter of fact, this tax on the economy's flexibility may be costing more in revenue than its repeal would lose. However that may be, no argument—financial or otherwise—is strong enough to sustain so obvious an inequity.

In confirmation of the above remarks, I would also like to include excerpts from letters now on file in my office received from individuals from all parts of the country citing their own personal experiences and losses incurred by company moves:

"In January of 1965, my company transferred me to Chicago from the West Coast. Last year I was assessed over \$500.00 on expense allowed me by my company for such costs as storage, house hunting trips, meals while living away from my family for three months, plus shelter cost for the same period, and other miscellaneous costs when my family was finally able to join me. This past month I finally sold my home in Tacoma, so my income tax for 1966 will show an additional cost of over \$400.00 for the expenses allowed me by my company in connection with the selling of this residence."

"Effective March 7th, I was transferred from my position in Philadelphia to assume

similar duties in the New York City area. A rough estimate of my presently taxable expenses incidental to the sale of my present home, purchase of a new one, etc. is about \$5,500.00. Since these reimbursements are treated as personal income and subjected to the maximum tax percentage in my income bracket, my transfer will cost me about \$1,600.00."

"It is estimated that my transfer to Chicago will cost approximately \$2,000 additional income tax on monies the Company reimbursed me for commission on my house sale and other related cost of moving. It takes a sizable promotional increase to be able to recapture \$2,000 worth of income tax, which in my opinion was not really income to me but just reimbursement of expenses I incurred due to this move."

Listed above are only a few of the many examples brought to my attention during the past few months. Recent surveys indicate that annually 150,000 persons employed by private industry; 35,000 persons employed by the Federal Government and 340,000 persons transferred by the Armed Services are affected financially by the present ruling.

I wish to thank those of my colleagues who have joined with me in sponsoring this remedial legislation and respectfully urge the support and efforts of all Members of Congress in the enactment of this bill.

Chicago Rebuilds Loop Area Under Leadership of Mayor Daley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, many newspapers and periodicals throughout our country have reported extensively on the giant strides that Chicago is making toward eliminating its slums, improving its highways, and rebuilding the loop area, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

Under the bold and dedicated leadership of Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of our city of Chicago, tremendous strides have been made and much has been accomplished.

What is not a commonly known fact, however, is that the rebuilding of the inner loop area has been accomplished without a single dollar of Federal urban renewal aid. In other major cities, such as New York and Philadelphia, more than two-thirds of the money spent for rebuilding portions of the central city came from Federal grants. Chicago, instead, has used only private funds for improving the downtown loop area. Of course, our great city has utilized Federal funds, but only for eliminating slums and rebuilding outside of the central city, or loop area.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared on June 6 in the Christian Science Monitor discussing the singular success achieved by Chicago's unusual approach to urban renewal. The article follows:

CHANGING CHICAGO: AN "UNBELIEVABLE CITY"

(By Alver Carlson)

CHICAGO.—"This unbelievable city can only be described as an architectural laboratory. When I return home, and am asked what I saw in America, I will say I saw Chicago."

This statement, made last week by a young Dutch journalist on tour throughout the United States on a university fellowship, was perhaps a bit overblown.

But Chicago today, despite its weaknesses, is a city with a face that has changed more in the last eight years than at any time since Mrs. O'Leary's cow put her foot down.

The most recent major building announcement gives a key to the pattern which a La Salle Street businessman once described thus: "It must be different, it must be dramatic, and it must be privately financed."

YEAR 1968 COMPLETION TARGET

The project, twin 40-story towers on Wabash Avenue, will sharply alter the city's skyline. It is scheduled to be completed by 1968.

One structure will be an 800-room hotel. The other will be an office building with 700,000 square feet of rentable area.

The plans also call for the construction of two 10-story parking facilities between the two buildings. Builder John J. Mack estimated the cost of the complex at \$40,000,000.

But there is more involved.

Chicago's central city is called the Loop after a rapid transit elevated system that circles it. This transit system has made it difficult for the area to shift or sprawl.

With the announcement of the twin towers, the city said it is studying, with a government grant, ways to remove the ugly old "L" structure. Part of it goes down the street where the new buildings will rise. (Most of the trains which once used the "L" tracks now run through two subway tubes.)

The most interesting part of the Loop's renewal is that it has been done without a single dollar of federal urban renewal aid.

FEDERAL AID ELSEWHERE

In the years between 1958 and 1965 the district saw completion of \$297,000,000 worth of office buildings with another \$117,500,000 under construction. Civic and public buildings accounted for another \$103,710,000, with \$53,840,000 worth of such construction under way.

Total construction figures that include stores, hotels and motels, and garages, show that an estimated \$1 billion worth has been completed, is under way, or has been announced since 1958. This is an area under 100 acres.

At about the same time, in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Boston, Cleveland, St. Louis, Denver, San Francisco, and other cities two-thirds of the money used to tear down and rebuild portions of their central areas came from federal grants, according to sources here.

The national spotlight focused on their Charles Centers and Penn Centers, and virtually ignored the Chicago approach that was achieving the same result.

While this city was certainly in favor of federal aid, it preferred to concentrate use of the funds on the slums that surrounded the Loop, which had been spreading tentacles of despair into the central city itself.

More than \$550,000,000 has been spent or is being spent by the government and private developers to rip out slums and replace them with decent, modern housing.

SLUM CLEARANCE STRESSED

Chicago had decided to put housing and slum clearance ahead of the central area, rightly judging that the great commercial Loop would look to itself.

Thus the Chicago pattern of central rebuilding became different. It can be described as partly sectional and partly piecemeal.

June 9, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12117

It seems unfortunate now that at Honolulu our President embraced Ky. Very definitely, when Ky talks of bringing democracy to South Vietnam, his record is very much against his statements. It has been a year since 10 generals, in a coup, overthrew the civilian government at Saigon and installed Ky as Prime Minister. Instead of carrying out land reforms which had been inaugurated some years previously, this militarist regime has canceled what little progress has been made.

Vietnam is of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States. Yet, our involvement there with armed forces of more than 300,000 men has turned this Vietnam civil war into an American war. The growing intensity is terrifying. We should embrace and not reject efforts made by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to bring about an armistice.

When Prime Minister Ky talks about elections in South Vietnam, he is in fact not talking about fair elections. It is reported that a condition laid down is that no member of the National Liberation Front may vote. Also, he has laid down the condition that no neutralist may vote. He is rigging the elections before making any definite plans for such elections. The International Control Commission, consisting of representatives of Poland, India, and Canada, set up in the Geneva agreements, is without a doubt the best body to supervise any elections if they are willing to undertake the task.

In the search for peace we should seek immediate deescalation of the war. Our first step should be to halt the bombings of North Vietnam and to offer to negotiate for settlement if representatives of Hanoi agree to consider a conference on the basis that delegates representing the four parties involved in this Vietnam civil war participate. There should be no objection on our part for the Hanoi and Saigon governments to be represented by the same number of delegates and these delegates to meet with an identical number of delegates representing the Vietcong, or National Liberation Front, and the United States. Such a conference should be arranged to convene in some Asiatic city.

Without a doubt, no armistice agreement could be successful and binding except with the support of international guarantees through the reconvening of the Geneva conference or under the authority of the International Control Commission. A drawback, perhaps, to having international guarantees supervised through the United Nations is that to this good hour Communist China has not been admitted into the United Nations.

This administration certainly should take the initiative in sounding out leaders of Asiatic nations regarding some realistic method of ending this bloodshed. For every Vietcong who has been killed and for every soldier of the so-called friendly forces of Vietnam, ARVN, undoubtedly more civilians—men, women, and children—have been killed, many by our napalm bombing. It has been estimated that four times as many civilians have had their lives snuffed out

than combat soldiers in the course of this fighting. U Thant's counsel should be followed by our leaders. If it is followed it seems probable that the tragic depopulation of Vietnam and loss of American lives will be brought to an end. Let us hope that such a conference will result in the neutralization of Vietnam and bring tranquillity to southeast Asia. Unfortunately, it has been rejected in the past.

The simple truth is entirely different than the propaganda which has been fed to the American people. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "U Thant's Counsel" be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

U THANT'S COUNSEL

Truth, as U Thant once observed, is one of the first victims of war. His words were confirmed once again this week as Secretary of State Rusk and Vice President HUMPHREY once again proclaimed the Administration's dedication to the search for peace in Viet Nam. Mr. Rusk repeated his offer to go to Geneva whenever anybody was there to negotiate with. Mr. HUMPHREY detailed anew the various peace offensives of the past and devoutly adopted U Thant's "prayer and wish" for peace as our own.

What is the simple truth? It is that the Administration spurned peace talk feelers repeatedly in 1964 and 1965. It is that U Thant's own efforts to arrange talks have been repeatedly and roughly rejected. It is that while publicly taking no sides in South Viet Nam's political turmoil the Administration has thrown every resource into the undercover support of a Saigon military junta whose first article of faith is an utter rejection of peace negotiations. It is that while paying lip-service to U Thant's "prayer and wish" the Administration obstinately refuses to heed U Thant's realistic counsel on the steps necessary to make peace.

The Secretary General of the UN renewed that counsel in his moving address to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers this week. Military methods, he said, will not restore peace; President Johnson once agreed with that. "This war must be stopped," said U Thant, "on the initiative of the participants, lest it get out of hand." And he repeated what he has often said, that the necessary conditions for peace include a return to the Geneva agreements, which were based on the principle of military neutralization of all Viet Nam; a prior scaling down of military operations (which would include an end to the bombing of North Viet Nam); and an agreement to negotiate with the actual combatants—in other words, the National Liberation Front as well as North Viet Nam.

These steps are reasonable if peace is genuinely the objective. So long as the United States rejects U Thant's counsel, which expresses the conscience of the world organization to which we so often pay verbal tribute, our verbal reiteration of peaceful intentions will fall on unbelieving ears throughout the world.

Some Americans, in bitter frustration, feel that the strands of history have become so hopelessly entangled that nothing can now be done to unravel an unwanted war. This seems plausible only in the context of the Administration's present policy, which is to back the Ky government's violent suppression of popular yearnings for peace and to continue escalation of the war.

If the basic decision were made to accept a negotiated settlement instead of chasing

the illusion of military victory; if we supported the Viet Name forces that favor reconciliation, rather than an armed dictatorship which opposes it; if we adopted as our policy the establishment of a compromise, neutral government permitting our ultimate withdrawal, instead of trying to establish an anti-Communist government that could only exist under our permanent military protection—in this context, many doors to peace and mediation would open.

No vital national interest of ours keeps the doors closed. It is pride and arrogance and illusion—the illusion that we are engaged in a holy ideological war. U Thant is right in saying that the somber course of events has probably left to the Viet Name people no ideology at all except a passion for national identity or even survival. He is right in saying that no government or people is "likely to lose in stature or dignity or worldly advantage" from coming to terms with the world in which we actually live. He is right in calling upon those who have the power and the responsibility "to search objectively and without rancor for ways to end this historic tragedy."

RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the New England Council under date of May 31, 1966, which I think will be of considerable interest to my fellow Senators who have been concerned with the residual oil quota situation over the past several years.

The letter reads as follows:

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1966.
Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: You will be pleased to know that directly as a result of your efforts in securing removal of residual oil quotas last month, the cost of residual oil to the consumer in New England has been restored to normal levels.

Quotations last week were down 85 cents a barrel from the period immediately before quotas were removed. There is now little, if any, difference between the world market price and the price charged to the New England consumer. In other words, the premium which the controls and the ticket system had added to the price of oil has disappeared.

It was our contention while the rigid quotas were in existence that the New England consumer was paying at least a 30 cent per barrel premium because of the controls. It would appear that this was a conservative estimate. Based upon our experience with what has happened over the past several weeks, it is reasonable to project that New England consumers will be saved over \$30 million this year alone.

You certainly have reason to be proud of this accomplishment.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

COLSON.

I do not think that this credit belongs to me. I do not think that this credit belongs to any group of individuals. I think it belongs to everyone who has been in this fight, particularly the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, who has been in the vanguard of this crusade, and his brilliant assistant, J. Cordell Moore, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, we have said right along that if this artificial system of distribu-